



No. \*9335.4A334

pts. 1-10







U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary.  
**COMMUNIST THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES  
THROUGH THE CARIBBEAN**

---

**HEARING**

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY  
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY  
UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

---

**PART V**

TESTIMONY OF HON. SPRUILLE BRADEN

---

JULY 17, 1959

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1960

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee  
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina  
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Missouri  
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas  
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming  
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina  
JOHN A. CARROLL, Colorado  
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut  
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin  
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska  
KENNETH B. KEATING, New York  
NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut, *Vice Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina  
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas  
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina

ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska  
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois  
KENNETH B. KEATING, New York  
NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire

J. G. SOURWINE, *Counsel*

BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

## CONTENTS

	Page
Statement of Hon. Spruille Braden-----	244

JUNE 1, 1960.

### RESOLUTION

*Resolved by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, That the testimony of Hon. Spruille Braden, given in executive session on July 17, 1959, with the consent of the witness, be printed and made public.*

JAMES O. EASTLAND, *Chairman.*  
THOMAS J. DODD, *Vice Chairman.*  
OLIN D. JOHNSTON.  
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.  
SAM J. ERVIN, JR.  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA.  
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.  
KENNETH B. KEATING.  
NORRIS COTTON.





# COMMUNIST THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES THROUGH THE CARIBBEAN

---

FRIDAY, JULY 17, 1959

U.S. SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT  
AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS,  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:10 p.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, Senator Olin D. Johnston presiding.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel, and Benjamin Mandel, director of research.

Senator JOHNSTON. The committee will come to order.

Before calling the witness, I shall place in the record a statement by the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator James O. Eastland.

(The statement reads as follows:)

## STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND, CHAIRMAN, INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE

In view of the threat to our national security implicit in recent events which have taken place in Cuba, 90 miles from our coastline, our subcommittee is privileged to present the views and comments of the Honorable Spruille Braden, former U.S. Ambassador to that country. Mr. Braden's distinguished diplomatic career has given him a deep insight into developments not only in Cuba but in Latin America as a whole. In 1933 he was the U.S. delegate to the Seventh International Conference of the American States held in Montevideo. In 1935 he served in a similar capacity at the Pan American Commercial Conference. He was chairman of the U.S. delegation, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at the Chaco Peace Conference of 1935-39. Mr. Braden represented President Roosevelt in 1939 as an arbitrator in the final settlement of the war between Bolivia and Paraguay. From 1939 to 1942 he served as American Ambassador to Colombia. In 1945, after 3 years' service in Cuba, he became Ambassador to Argentina, and, in that same year, was appointed Assistant Secretary of State for American Republic Affairs.

While there may be some difference of opinion regarding Mr. Braden's views and recommendations, there can be no doubt that, in the light of his broad and extended experience in Latin America,

these views and recommendations are entitled to the respect and careful study of his fellow Americans.

Senator JOHNSTON. Now, Mr. Braden, will you raise your right hand and take an oath.

Do you swear that the evidence you give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BRADEN. So help me God, I do.

Senator JOHNSTON. Have a seat.

### TESTIMONY OF HON. SPRUILLE BRADEN

Mr. SOURWINE. Your name is Spruille Braden.

Mr. BRADEN. Spruille Braden.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba?

Mr. BRADEN. Former U.S. Ambassador to the Chaco Conference, to Colombia, Cuba, Argentina, and Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, we have asked Ambassador Braden to come prepared to give us what information he believes would be helpful in connection with the subject of our study, which, in connection with these hearings, is the Communist threat to the United States through the Caribbean. Instead of asking a number of specific questions, if it is suitable to the chairman, I would suggest that the Ambassador be told to go right ahead and tell us in his own words what he has in mind.

Senator JOHNSTON. Yes. You know how to proceed, knowing what the object of this committee is—to try to learn the facts and how to prevent the current unrest in the Caribbean from undermining our own Government.

We would like to have facts and I think you know how to develop those facts.

Mr. BRADEN. I took the liberty of preparing a brief statement.

I am getting away for Chile next Friday so that I have been a little bit rushed in all of this but I have a brief statement if I could read that.

Senator JOHNSTON. You may proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. Before you start, sir, I would like to ask in connection with your statement that you are leaving next Friday, if the committee desires to hear you in public session would you be available some day next week, say Tuesday of next week?

Mr. BRADEN. It would be awfully hard.

Mr. SOURWINE. You would have no time for public session between now and that time?

Mr. BRADEN. It would be very difficult to get down from New York for it. As a matter of fact, Tuesday would be out. Thursday is out because I am sailing Friday morning. I am a trustee of the Dry Dock Savings Bank in New York and I have a meeting on Tuesday morning and a real estate committee meeting Thursday—

Mr. SOURWINE. How long will you be gone?

Mr. BRADEN. I will be gone until the end of September. It would be awfully hard for me to do it. I will do it if it is essential.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you couldn't come down here could we come to you?

Mr. BRADEN. That would be much better if you could do that.

Senator JOHNSTON. We might have to do that.

Mr. SOURWINE. I anticipate that this testimony might be very valuable to the committee.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator JOHNSTON. Proceed.

Mr. BRADEN. I appreciate more than I can express adequately the invitation to appear before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, because not only has this committee through the years performed a great and patriotic service, but it has proven itself to be one of the best safeguards and defenses of the United States.

In the interests of brevity and because already, in previous testimony before this committee, I have given details of my experiences in Latin America in diplomacy, business, and otherwise, I omit any curriculum vitae now.

Mr. SOURWINE. You testified before us in 1953?

Mr. BRADEN. And 1954, yes. Perhaps as a chopping block leading to questions and discussion I best may summarize my opinion in respect of Cuba and the Caribbean area generally by saying that, in all of my many years of intimate contact since early childhood with Latin America, never have I seen the situation so dangerous as it is now for the defense of the United States.

The principal threat to our security, of course, is communism and its ever present weapon—anti-Americanism. But this menace is aided and exacerbated by other Marxist influences, by socialism, misguided idealism, and unsound nationalisms, all of which, unless eradicated at an early date, will convert the Caribbean into a Red lake.

So grave is the situation, that I pray with all my heart, body, and soul, that the Communists and their most useful tool to date, Fidel Castro, may be ejected from their control of Cuba.

Unless this is done soon—very soon by the Cubans—the United States and other American Republics, for their own security, may be catapulted against their will into a most unfortunate intervention in Cuban affairs.

This would be a major catastrophe for the inter-American system and the United States. It is precisely one of the Communists' objectives.

This committee will recall my testimony before it when on December 22, 1953, and March 25, 1954, I described how I had been able in Cuba, as Ambassador of the United States—

(1) To destroy (with the approval of all my diplomatic colleagues in Havana, excepting only the Soviet representative but including the Cuban Foreign Minister) a Communist organization known as "El Frente Nacional Anti-Fascisti" (National Anti-Fascist Front), and put an end to the public meetings they were staging each year on the Soviet holiday. (This incident I described fully in my 1954 testimony before this committee.)

(2) To block the machinations of Harry Dexter White, Assistant Secretary of Treasury of the United States, and Lawrence Duggan, Adviser to the Secretary of State, in respect of an insidious scheme to establish a Central Bank and Cuban currency on such conditions as inevitably would have led to financial chaos in that country, thus opening the way for the Communists to get a foothold there.

In the aforementioned testimony, while expressing a high regard for the vast majority of the Career Foreign Service, their integrity and intelligence, I also detailed the infiltration of the Department of State by, as I then expressed it, relatively few Communists, a number of Socialists, misguided idealists, and as I christened them, "Un-identifiable Theys." I described Alger Hiss' intervention in connection with our bases in Panama, and the attempt—which I blocked—to put over on the State Department an organization of 1,080 persons, under the name of "Office of Research and Intelligence." This plot hatched in Alger Hiss' office had extremely dangerous implications.

In that testimony I gave documentary evidence of the warnings about Communist infiltration in this hemisphere which repeatedly I had sounded from Havana, when I was Ambassador there, just as I had in "Top Secret" telegrams sent in July 1945 to the President and Secretary of State from Buenos Aires, where I was then Ambassador. These telegrams described the serious Communist threat to this hemisphere and how Peron was working hand in glove with the Kremlin.

I urged that President Truman and Churchill, at the Potsdam Conference, confront Stalin with these facts and demand that an end be put to these Moscow contrivings. So far as I have been able to ascertain, neither of these telegrams, sent "For the President and the Secretary of State of the United States," by a U.S. Ambassador, was ever delivered.

It therefore does not surprise me when some of our Cuban and other Latin American friends are convinced that Castro and other anti-U.S. leaders are tipped off by friends within our own Government as to just how far they can go with impunity.

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you think happened to those telegrams, Mr. Ambassador?

Mr. BRADEN. There was another somewhat similar incident later in the Department which makes me sure those cables were blocked in the State Department. They must have been, they were top secret and should have gone directly to the President and Secretary of State.

Jimmy Byrnes assured me that he never received those telegrams.

Mr. SOURWINE. He was Secretary of State at the time?

Mr. BRADEN. Secretary of State. I think they got to the State Department and somebody realized how vitally important they were and that they simply were stopped and never delivered. Conceivably they were destroyed by agents working inside the Department.

Senator JOHNSTON. Who was acting at that time as his secretary and adviser, do you recall?

Mr. BRADEN. The Under Secretary at that time was Dean Acheson.

Senator JOHNSTON. Dean Acheson?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes. You will find him referred to several times in my previous testimony.

Senator JOHNSTON. Jimmy Byrnes was what?

Mr. BRADEN. Jimmy Byrnes was Secretary of State.

Senator JOHNSTON. Did Don Russell have anything in there?

Mr. BRADEN. Don Russell was Assistant Secretary in charge of Administration and I would like to make just as emphatic as I can that Don Russell was on the right side of these issues from start to finish.



Senator JOHNSTON. So you don't think he got——

Mr. BRADEN. Oh, no. Don Russell probably never knew of them.

Senator JOHNSTON. I don't think he would do anything wrong, but what I was figuring on, he might keep Jim out of trouble there.

Mr. BRADEN. I don't think so. Don would have realized how very important what I said was, because I recited chapter and verse and I referred to many dispatches I had sent from Havana in which I told of the Communist situation there, and I am sure that Don would have had it go through to the Secretary.

Senator JOHNSTON. Do you know of any way for us to trace those telegrams, where it went to?

Mr. BRADEN. I testified on this in 1954. I have inquired in the State Department myself repeatedly, and they just disappeared off the face of the map apparently.

Senator JOHNSTON. Did you receive any answer?

Mr. BRADEN. I never received an answer from them.

Mr. SOURWINE. They were sent through departmental channels?

Mr. BRADEN. Sent in code, in one of our top-secret codes from our Embassy to the Department of State.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that there would be no record of them anywhere except within the Department?

Mr. BRADEN. Within the Embassy and the Department of State. Subsequently, when I came back to Washington and became Assistant Secretary of State, I received some letters, but one case in particular that convinced me that there were Communists in the State Department was as follows: An Ambassador Levelier who had been the Argentine Ambassador in Mexico, and subsequently Uruguay, wrote me a letter and sent a memorandum with that letter. He got the letter over to Uruguay mailed from Montevideo. Maybe Peron had somebody in the Uruguayan Post Office, I don't know, but the letter came to my hands in the State Department. I drafted a reply and I sent it by pouch to the Embassy with instructions to the Embassy that one of the secretaries there was to call in Ambassador Levelier and deliver my letter to him by hand. I don't think Peron or his administration ever were smart enough to penetrate the State Department but the fact remains that Peron got hold of both Levelier's letter and memorandum to me and my reply to him and had them photostated and published in his newspaper.

The only plausible explanation is that somewhere in the Department between my desk and going into the pouch there was a leak.

Senator JOHNSTON. Now what was the approximate date of that?

Mr. BRADEN. That correspondence I would say was the end of 1945.

Mr. SOURWINE. I diverted you, sir.

Would you go on back to your statement?

Mr. BRADEN. I recited to this committee with documents, the oft-repeated instructions which I had given in my capacity as Assistant Secretary of State in Washington to my staff about the utter immorality of communism and the perils we faced from it in the Americas.

In short, gentlemen, time and time again I warned, with the citation of concrete cases, of the danger of communism to the security of the American Continents.

Similarly, I submitted to this committee a copy of a speech delivered by me at Dartmouth College on March 12, 1953, sounding the alarm in respect of Communist infiltration in Guatemala.

Unfortunately, my many warnings were ignored, but subsequent events proved them to be absolutely accurate.

Senator JOHNSTON. I wonder if we could get a copy of that speech.

Mr. MANDEL. We have put it in the record previously.

Senator JOHNSTON. That's fine.

Mr. BRADEN. In early or mid-1957, I gave an interview to *Human Events*, in which I told of certain activities of Fidel Castro—now Prime Minister of Cuba—activities in respect of the Communist-inspired insurrections in Bogota during the Inter-American Conference held in that city in April 1948, and I declared that he was either a Communist or their tool, and that his victory would bring political and economic chaos and the tyranny of communism to Cuba.

(The interview as printed in *Human Events* of August 17, 1957, reads as follows:)

#### CUBAN REVOLT

Many on the Hill are beginning to say now: "We ought to be worrying more about the Communist menace in Latin America, on our very doorstep, than about communism in the faraway Middle East." What's really behind the revolt led by Fidel Castro against the Cuban Government, billed by the *New York Times* and the liberal press as a simple rebellion against dictatorship, comes into clearer focus from the following statement, obtained exclusively by the staff of *Human Events* from former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba Spruille Braden. This retired American diplomat has long qualified as an expert not only on Cuba but also on all Latin America; having served in other posts south of the border, he has in recent years won recognition as a critical observer of the workings of the Communist apparatus in the Caribbean and South America.

Mr. Braden says of Fidel Castro, leader of the fledgling Cuban revolt, that, according to official documents he has seen, "He is a fellow traveler, if not a member of the Communist Party and has been so for a long time. He was a ringleader in the bloody uprising in Bogotá, Colombia, in April 1948, which occurred (and obviously was planned by the Kremlin) just at the time when the Pan American Conference was being held in that capital, with no less a person than Secretary of State George C. Marshall present. The uprising was engineered and staged by Communists, and the Colombian Government and Colombia press subsequently published documentary evidence of Fidel Castro's role as a leader in the rioting which virtually gutted the Colombian capital. The appearance of this Cuban at the head of the recent uprising in his own country stamps the insurrection as another part of the developing Communist pattern of such subversion throughout Latin America—although a number of thoroughly decent and patriotic Cubans have been misled into sympathizing with, and in some cases supporting, the Fidel Castro movement."

Mr. BRADEN. I am a trustee of the U.S. Council of the Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production, an organization of important businessmen throughout the Americas, members of some of the biggest firms in the United States. Because my earlier warnings had been futile, at a meeting of the U.S. Council Commerce and Production on October 4, 1957, where the main speaker was to be Mr. Terry B. Sanders, Director of the South American Division in the State Department, who had served under me in Colombia, I sent through him a most emphatic message to the higher echelons of the Department.

I requested Terry—and I have a high regard for him as an honest and intelligent man and he later wrote to me that he had followed my request—I requested Terry to tell all of the high officials, up to and including the Secretary of State, that:

The State Department was thoroughly familiar with the fact that no Ambassador had ever had a more violent collision with a Chief of State than I had had with Fulgencio Batista, when I was in Cuba. Therefore, I had no preconceptions or delusions in respect of him. I knew his many bad points and I knew his good points. But I observed that when the United States, in the face of the solid support against the Soviet and communism given us by the Batista regime, refused to slip arms to that Government (bought and paid for by it, frequently on the recommendations of our military, naval and air missions), it inevitably would convince the Cuban people that we were supporting Castro and opposed to Batista. I said that this interpretation would lead to Castro's victory, which would result in chaos throughout Cuba, which in turn would lead to Communist control of that island.

This is exactly what happened. A Communist reign of terror now overwhelms Cuba. My message was delivered by Sanders to the higher echelons of the Department, but it was ignored. As a result, we now are reduced to the extremity of trying to close the barn door after the horse has been stolen.

Practically every development in the Pearl of the Antilles since January 1, 1959, has confirmed the increasing domination by the Communists in government and every other sphere of life in that country, with the result that today the Government of Cuba is completely Communist-controlled, and every non-Communist citizen of that country fears for his own life and that of his loved ones.

Of course, like every other Communist regime, they deny this fact, which can be proven readily by a series of incidents and events, as in their public declarations they pretend to be, as they call it, "democratic."

I request that a speech which I gave before the Rotary Club of New York on April 9 and repeated before the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs on April 10 be made a part of the record.

I think it might be worthwhile, with your permission, to read you just a few paragraphs of that speech.

It touches on communism in general, but particularly in Latin America.

Mr. SOURWINE. May the whole speech go in the record at this point?

Senator JOHNSTON. It shall go into the record at this point.

(The text of the document referred to reads as follows:)

Always it is a pleasure to find one's self in such a cordial Rotarian atmosphere as this. It is inspiring to be with a group so devoted, with high ethical standards, to service for their fellow men and the advancement of international friendship. I am honored by your invitation today.

Because this is Pan American Week, I should have liked to restrict my remarks to the more pleasant aspects of this hemisphere's affairs. But it is untimely to do so when the 21 American Republics and Canada are threatened by the gravest peril ever to menace any civilization—that of Communist aggression and conquest.

Under these circumstances, I feel in duty bound to discuss the worldwide conditions underscoring the fact that an impregnable fortress must be made of the Americas. This hemisphere must be ready and able to repulse any and every attack from behind the Iron Curtain, whether it be by missiles, atom and hydrogen bombs, or conventional arms, or through subversion and espionage or other nefarious measures.

It is a mortal sin to tolerate Communists anywhere. But above all, it is a sin to tolerate them or their fellowtravelers, and other misguided collaborators, in any American Government. Witness the statement by Lieutenant General



Trudeau, the U.S. Army's Chief of Research and formerly of Intelligence, that the Soviet's rapid military advances reflected successful espionage within the U.S.A., rather than scientific powers within the U.S.S.R.

In connection with the Berlin crisis, we are assured by President Eisenhower and his advisers that presently we are equipped to defend ourselves against a Soviet military attack. Some Members of Congress, challenging these assurances, propose to investigate the situation thoroughly. I pray that they will come up with the right answers.

Not being a military expert, I shall not presume to analyze this phase of the Communist threat to the survival of the independent sovereign nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Instead, I shall limit myself to three observations:

(1) Allies will remain together only so long as their interests are parallel or of such a nature as to make it mutually worthwhile. Always, to count on allies when the chips go down is foolish sentimentality. The validity of George Washington's Farewell advice remains unaltered by time, space, or science, because it rests on the facts of life and human nature. He counseled: "Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances, with any portion of the foreign world."

(2) Everyone respects power, and nothing succeeds like success. If we will make the U.S.A. and this hemisphere so strong as possible spiritually, economically, and militarily, other nations will feel that their best interests will be served by being on our side, and to this end, will make themselves strong. This is the best way to get responsible partners.

All of our World War I and II allies—not to mention West Germany—now are far wealthier and more prosperous, with larger populations than ever before. Yet the U.S.A. is supposed financially to support and help equip even their present relatively small armies, which numerically are only a fraction of what they previously put in the field. Do they lack the gumption to defend themselves? To me, as a layman, it just does not make sense that we should have to carry their burdens indefinitely. Parenthetically, it is pertinent to observe that Rome only fell after she began hiring foreign mercenaries for her defense.

(3) Our attempts to buy allies through the so-called mutual security or foreign aid programs often have failed.

Only last month, a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee reported that nations with untrained soldiers demand and get from us modern equipment, which then remains unused; that U.S. military deliveries by truck had to be canceled because the recipient governments did not provide gasoline and antifreeze; that planes assigned for military use were turned over for the personal pleasure of government officials; that supplies authorized for military construction had been dedicated to the erection of civilian apartment houses; and that one motor pool had 44 spare tires for each truck. Such things have been cropping up continually in every investigation by Congress or the General Accounting Office.

Much more serious are the exposures by the House Committee on Government Operations, of many other shocking conditions surrounding what the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) has done. In January 1958, this committee, in an official report, asked: "How much of the \$24 billion appropriated by the Congress for this (military aid) program has been wasted?" Never have I seen an answer to this question. Instead, the President and his assistants and advisers continue their demands for more billions to give away.

In order that you may grasp what this one item of \$24 billion really amounts to, let me say that it is a couple of billion dollars more than the assessed valuation of all the real and personal property in the city of New York including all five boroughs.

As I told you at the outset, I shall leave the discussion of military matters to those who are better equipped for it than I. Instead, I wish to say that in my opinion, the most dangerous Soviet weapons are subversion and espionage. These are employed so deceitfully, slyly and insidiously that often we are unaware of them until the harm has been done. The vast majority of the peoples of this hemisphere, to whom such evil methods are repugnant, do not realize that every Communist, if needs be, will lie, torture and murder. The only thing the Reds understand or respect is greater power than theirs. This I know from firsthand experience. Either we destroy communism or it will destroy us.

Just as the world refused to believe that the Nazis and Hitler in "Mein Kampf," time after time meant what they said about their intentions for world conquest, so now a majority of the people throughout the Americas ignore the plain but cumulative testimony of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Mao Tse-



tung, and countless other Communist leaders, as to their real objectives. Their testimony has been confirmed by everything they have planned or done since 1917. Not a single decent or honest act ever has been recorded by them, except by sheer coincidence or to serve their own convenience.

This ignorance of Communist real intent appears in all walks of life. For instance, Adm. Wolfgang Larrazábal, recently upon concluding his service as Interim President of Venezuela, went to Chile as Ambassador. There, in a press conference, he made the following statement:

"The Communist Party is a legal political party in Venezuela, which collaborates in a patriotic form toward the unity of the Venezuelan people. I received its support happily and gratefully, with the 150,000 votes which they disinterestedly gave to my candidacy. Above everything, they are Venezuelans and desire the best for the people of which they are a part. They have an ideology, but equally they are disposed to die for their cause and have gained the respect of the Venezuelan nation."

Larrazábal undoubtedly is an honest Christian gentleman. Yet, as a military leader of top rank, who has served as chief magistrate of his country, he has been unbelievably hoodwinked and is abysmally ignorant of Communist objectives. If an appreciable number of Venezuelans share his opinion, that nation and the American Republics are in serious trouble.

On the other hand, it would be entirely illogical for us too severely to criticize Admiral Larrazábal, when we in the United States set such a bad example. How can we blame our neighbors to the south, if following in our footsteps, they visit and negotiate with the Soviet or indulge in cultural, scientific, artistic, economic, agricultural, and all kinds of interchanges with Iron Curtain enemy countries.

Perhaps one of the worst U.S.A. blunders, which is building up the Communist regimes, and discouraging freedom-loving peoples everywhere—especially those enslaved behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—is that through mutual security and foreign aid, we finance and support Communist and Socialist regimes all over the world.

We are saving Khrushchev the trouble of burying us, as he said he would do, by digging our own graves. We do this when we support communism, the anti-Christ, by giving billions to Tito, Gomulka, and other Marxist regimes. They may squabble a bit amongst themselves, but every one of them is dedicated to the annihilation of our faith, our Nation, and our independence; and they have repeatedly and publicly said so. They will stop at nothing to enslave and debauch all mankind.

Dostoyevsky, even before the days of Hitler or Lenin, of black or red totalitarianism, knew that socialism inevitably leads to a cruel authoritarianism and foresaw what communism would be when he wrote:

"The future kingdom of socialism will be a terrible tyranny of criminals and murderers. It will throw humanity into a true hell of spiritual suffering and poverty."

Instead of naively talking about peace or coexistence with any Communist regime, it would be safer for us, North, South, and Central Americans, to recall, that like Hitler, a top Kremlin leader, Dmitri Z. Manuïlsky, in 1931 called the Communist shots in advance to the students of the Lenin School of Political Warfare, when he said:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep.

"So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists."

Twenty-eight of those 20 to 30 years have gone by. Too many people including too many political leaders are dozing or sound asleep. Moscow's peace overtures are being pressed. The storm signals are up. Summit and other conferences with Soviet leaders enhance their prestige, lower ours, and sadly discourage the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain who pray for freedom.

The United States, since the end of World War II, has been repeating the blunders made by Athenians in their conflict with Philip of Macedonia. Demosthenes, in his first Phillippic, sounded a sad but true warning, which is just as applicable today for the Americas, as it was for Athens when he gave it:

"It is shameful to deceive one's self, and by delaying or putting aside what is disagreeable, always to take action too late, and to fail to understand that those who carry on a war must not follow events, but must anticipate and lead events \* \* \* and \* \* \* not finding themselves reduced to running after events already consummated. But you Athenians, who have the greatest power in the world \* \* \* ships, heavily armed infantry, cavalry, and economic strength, up to the present hour have not taken advantage of many opportunities. You are making war against Philip in the same way as a stupid lout trades blows; that is, when a fool has been hit, he covers that part of his body which has been hurt: if he is punched somewhere else, his hands rapidly go to that point. These fools neither know how to lead with a blow nor how to protect themselves. They are amateurs against skilled boxers. You are the same. If you know that Philip is in Amphypolis, you send aid there.

"If he is in Thermopylae, there you go. And if he is somewhere else, you go hither and yonder. You allow yourselves to be managed by him without taking any initiative of your own; you make no decisions which will help the course of the war. Neither do you foresee events. You do not know what is happening until after it has happened. Up to now, perhaps you have been able to get away with this. But we are approaching the culminating moment when such tactics no longer will be possible."

This is precisely what we have been doing as, with military or economic foreign aid, we have dashed from Greece and Turkey to Europe, to Berlin, on to Korea, then to Cairo, to Vietnam, back to the Near East, on to the Formosa Straits, Quemoy, and Matsu, and now back to Berlin. The Kremlin pipes the tune and we dance to it.

Each time Moscow or one of the satellites feints or makes a menacing gesture, the Washington bureaucrats immediately seize upon it as an excuse to disgorge more billions of the U.S. taxpayers' money in foreign "giveaways." Berlin is the current excuse; although too few Americans realize that no part of the new foreign aid billions presently being demanded for the next fiscal year, will be spent in the defense of Berlin.

In the economic area, since 1946, both Democratic and Republican administrations have been hopping hither and yon all over the globe, handing out upward of \$80 billion in grants and loans.

We advantageously could heed the experience of Byzantium. As Prof. George Peter Murdock writes:

"\* \* \* the foreign policy of the Eastern Roman Empire sought always to impress less fortunate peoples with the wealth and prosperity of Constantinople, and used lavish foreign aid as its principal diplomatic instrument." To the Byzantine rulers, "The crudest, simplest, and most direct way of influencing foreign nations was by means of money. Money was always regarded by Byzantine diplomats as being an irresistible argument, in and out of season \* \* \*. The squandering of resources and neglect of vital interests was more than once a matter of concern to observant and thoughtful men."<sup>1</sup>

No more accurate description could be given of foreign aid as the cardinal principle in the Truman-Eisenhower foreign policy. I pray that before it becomes too late Washington will heed the tragic results in Byzantium; where "When the Turks threatened, friends purchased by money proved false friends, and the once resplendent Eastern Empire shrank to a hollow shell and ultimately collapsed without a struggle."<sup>2</sup>

The President, on March 13, when urging an appropriation for foreign aid of nearly \$4 billion, declared: "It is not the goal of the American people that the United States should be the richest nation in the graveyard of history." The real danger, based on the experiences of Greece, Rome, Byzantium, and every other civilization which has perished, is that the United States, if it continues to squander its wealth, will wind up as the poorest nation in the graveyard of history.

To ignore both history and the commonsense proposition that one cannot buy friends would be foolhardy enough. But one of the greatest ironies of the 20th century is that the United States foreign aid program is following Communist dictates to the letter:

<sup>1</sup> Charles Diehl.

<sup>2</sup> Prof. George Peter Murdock.

1. It piles more billions on top of the already extravagantly bloated U.S. budgets and deficits. It accounts for nearly one-third of this year's Federal deficit of \$12 billion.

It aggravates inflation, lowers the purchasing power of the dollar, devalues the people's savings, and brings on countless other economic evils and distortions.

It has taken the product of 600,000 workers in this country largely to give away abroad. This adds still more to inflation. By thus bankrupting our country, foreign aid adheres to Lenin's formula for defeating and destroying the capitalist nations by, as he said, "debauching their currencies."

It likewise often causes inflation, economic and political upheavals in the recipient countries.

2. Our foreign aid programs closely coincide with an old and basic Communist policy set forth by Lenin and Stalin and which can be summarized by the latter's explanation that if communism were to succeed in conquering the world, the Western nations' rear guard, i.e., their reserves in the dependent and colonial areas, must be revolutionized. He said:

"That is why it is essential that the proletariat of the advanced countries should render real and prolonged aid to the backward nationalities in their cultural and economic development.

"Unless such aid is forthcoming, it will be impossible to bring the various nations and peoples within a single world economic system that is so essential for the final triumph of socialism."

On January 3, the State Department—in all ill-disguised attempt to frighten the public and Congress in order to get increased foreign aid appropriations—announced that the Soviet bloc, including China, is committed to provide \$1.9 billion of assistance to 10 less developed countries and that, therefore, the United States must greatly increase its aid and ease its terms.

Actually, the entire Soviet bloc up to the end of 1956, has extended about \$2.8 billion for economic and technical assistance, of which only \$400 million was spent outside the bloc. These figures are at the tourist exchange rate of 10 rubles to the dollar; they would be much smaller at open market rates—merely peanuts compared to our foreign giveaways. Moreover, they probably were exaggerated by the Kremlin statistician. Finally, the Communist bloc never gives something for nothing, as we do.

In view of the basic Lenin-Stalin Communist policy, it is astonishing that the Soviet bloc has been so stingy and lagged so far behind us. The explanation probably is that (a) as Stalin intended, we, the advanced Nation, have been doing a superb job for the Kremlin's benefit, and all for free; and (b) the Soviet group even on a trading basis cannot afford to deal in such vast sums as the United States has squandered on foreign aid.

While the 21 American Republics always should be alert to and never permit themselves to be victimized by the U.S.S.R.'s economic warfare, it is infinitely more important that Communist inspired and directed subversion and espionage be uncovered and summarily suppressed. This cannot be done effectively so long as the governmental and social structures of the American Republics too often are weakened and made timid by socialism or any other misguided idealism.

It was just such weakness and timidity which at first prevented the United States from taking positive action to support Col. Castillo Armas, in his drive to overthrow the Arbenz Communist regime in Guatemala, to whom we had given foreign aid. Fortunately for all of us, President Somoza of Nicaragua courageously saved the day by supplying arms and planes to Castillo Armas. Later, a number of Latin American Ambassadors pointed out to the State Department that if the Communists continued to control Guatemala, similar regimes would crop up in other American countries, and that since we were being accused of intervention anyway, we might as well intervene by giving Castillo Armas support, thus saving the situation. At the Ambassador's behest, we added our help to wipe out the first modern Communist government established on this hemisphere. That was a narrow escape. It behooves all the hemispheres to see to it that we don't come so close to a debacle again.

The tragic epilog is that the Communists, in due course, got their revenge through the assassinations of both Castillo Armas and Somoza.

Merely for the purpose of perpetuating the huge and growing ICA bureaucracy, or for any other reason it is dishonest to waste the U.S. taxpayers' money on foreign aid programs, which benefit neither the recipient countries nor the



United States. Yet, that is precisely what we have been doing in Bolivia by donating \$129 million in grants over the last 6 years. Reputedly this works out to more per capita than anywhere else in the world.

Under Secretary of State C. Douglas Dillon admitted on January 29 speaking about Bolivia to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, "\* \* \* but we can't see that even though we are making substantial contributions in economic aid, that the situation is improving." He blamed the worsening scale of living in Bolivia on lower metal prices and smaller production. Due to the Marxist government's confiscation of mines, its inefficiency and socialistic regimentation, it is true that production has dropped. But excepting for a very brief period since 1952, when the national revolutionary movement (MNR) and Communists seized power in Bolivia, metal prices have averaged considerably higher than in any previously comparable period.

What we have done in Bolivia, if anything, is more shocking than our financing of the Polish and Yugoslav Communists, because we have kept alive a Marxist regime in the very center of what we have called the good neighborhood.

In the March 23 issue of Time magazine, Mr. Roger A. Freeman, vice president of the Institute for Social Science Research, makes the following statement:

"I served as fiscal officer to the Bolivian Government on a special U.S. mission in 1956-57. I returned with the conviction that a continuation of U.S. aid policies would lead to further economic and social deterioration and disaster \* \* \* the real power is in the hands of the armed and Communist led mineworkers' unions, who will not permit the steps necessary to economic recovery. U.S. aid policy has, for the past 6 years, been strengthening their hand."

Juan Lechin, the Communist leader of the mineworkers, while serving as Minister of Mines, declared in a public speech that his Government was even more radical than that of the Chinese Communists (sic). I suggest that that is the ultimate in radicalism. Now this same Government which we support so lavishly, came to power by force, including imprisonment, torture and death for hundreds of opposition leaders and ordinary citizens, who did not happen to belong to the MNR or Communist Parties. Incidentally, its first President, Paz Estenssoro, during the Second World War, joined a Nazi-inspired conspiracy against the United States and its allies and was denounced officially therefor by the U.S. Government. Hundreds of responsible and reputable Bolivians, who through the years, have proven their friendship for the United States and their anticommunism, have been murdered and tortured, imprisoned and exiled, or compelled to flee for their lives.

Because Time magazine recently claimed to quote a member of the U.S. Embassy Staff, renewing a suggestion previously made by several Latin Americans, that Bolivia be divided up by her neighbors, there were anti-U.S. riots in La Paz on March 2. Our Embassy was stoned and the U.S. Information Agency's reading rooms were wrecked. The 200 U.S. Government employees in La Paz had to take refuge outside the capital under the protection of armed guards. These riots were not spontaneous, but incited. So bad was the situation, that proposed visits to La Paz by high State Department officers had to be canceled. President Siles Suazo, who because of our substantial aid, should be our friend, referred to the Time article as "reflecting the thought of international capitalism."

Clearly, the Communists activated these demonstrations, just as they did those last year against Vice President Nixon. But State Department and CIA ineptitude also have been factors, plus the waste, extravagance and corruption with which U.S. foreign aid has been handled. Also, all too frequently, the recipients of charity hate the giver.

A leading newspaper, La Prensa, of Lima, Peru, sums up the situation as follows:

"After 6 years of a 'progressive' government, Bolivia depends more than ever in its history on 'Yankee imperialism,' to the extreme of having practically a parasite economy. Misery is greater than ever and the dollar has gone higher in price than in any other country" (in these 6 years it has gone from 190 pesos to 13,000 pesos to the dollar).

Communists have been stirring up trouble on an increasing scale throughout the hemisphere. Witness the recent wildcat strike on the Mexican railroads, which that country's attorney general called a Communist plot. Instigating it were two officials of the U.S.S.R. Embassy, plus apparently another couple from a satellite diplomatic mission. Similar strikes on tramways, buslines, and in

industry have been provoked in Colombia, Chile, Argentina, and elsewhere by Communists.

As late as on March 22, Cuba's new Prime Minister, Fidel Castro, in a speech proclaimed his country's "neutralism" and protested against the United States continuing its naval base at Guantanamo. He declared that aggression against his country did not originate overseas—i.e., from Russia—and that Cuban women and children should be armed to resist attacks which threatened from the beaches of Florida or the Dominican Republic. He observed that the selfishness and exploitation by the great trusts and interests (presumably from the United States) have killed more Cubans than "the Batista tyranny."

It becomes relatively unimportant to argue whether Fidel Castro is merely a misguided idealist, an economic charlatan, or that most dangerous kind of dictator, one with a messianic complex. The overriding danger lies in the fact that so many of his words and actions strictly follow "the Communist line." Also, he allegedly is surrounded by Communists or fellow travelers, among whom have been mentioned his brother Raul and the Argentine, "Che" Guevara, who was active under Arbenz in Guatemala.

It is to be hoped that we will not again be lured into the futile procedure of trying to buy Castro off by giving him foreign aid.

In particular, I pray that we do not wake up some morning to find the Caribbean being converted into a Communist lake. In such an event, the other American Republics, including the United States, for their own protection, would be compelled to intervene with arms. This, of course, would be a major catastrophe from the point of view of the friendship and solidarity of the Americas.

Just as has happened elsewhere in the world, in recent years even in this hemisphere we have been compelled to turn our attention hither and yonder, from Guatemala under Arbenz, to Bolivia under MNR and Communist leadership, and now to Cuba under Castro. We do not foresee events, but only know what has happened after it has happened. Like Byzantium, we try to influence foreign nations with money, not realizing the proven fact that foreign aid is no antidote for communism anywhere in the world.

Any criticisms I have made about our Latin American neighbors being ignorant of the mortal danger of communism to their own survival and permitting themselves to be infiltrated and undermined by that evil, apply equally to the United States.

While friendship and solidarity never can be bought by handouts, some of our neighbors to the south often are irked and feel neglected, as they see the United States doling out billions all over the globe as opposed to a relatively few hundreds of millions spent in this hemisphere. They have a point, because the defense and development of our two continents should be the first consideration, far more important to us than Europe, Asia, or the Near East.

Whether in or out of this hemisphere, under no circumstances should U.S. aid be given to:

1. Communist states.
2. Neutralist regimes. There is much truth in the old saying that "those who are not with me are against me."
3. Countries possessing such wealth of their own as to require no help from abroad.
4. Governments who are in economic difficulties, due to their own blunders or waste, extravagance or corruption. Mistakes are the best teacher and there is no better way to avoid future mistakes than by being forced to pay for those we have made in the past.

Since so-called U.S. foreign aid never has halted the spread of communism anywhere, what then are our best defense weapons to be used for the protection of this hemisphere? In my opinion, they are:

(a) The best defense is a good offense. Let's stop pretending that the Communists and the Soviet respect and understand anything other than power superior to their own. Summit conferences and all talk of coexistence should be eliminated. Nor should our side keep proclaiming that never will it make the first moves. Some day our very survival may compel us to attack.

(b) The maintenance of superior power in this hemisphere. In our self-interest we should be glad to have allies elsewhere, but never count on them too much.

(c) For our common survival all the peoples of the Americas must educate themselves thoroughly on the Communist ideology and plans and Soviet strategy.

(d) Never must we forget that charity, well directed, begins at home.

(e) As I have repeatedly recommended for more than 15 years, we should take advantage of the Latins' instinctive and wonderful sense of humor. There are dozens of cartoonists and humorists throughout the hemisphere whose ridicule would bring the world to join with us in laughing the Soviet and Communist lies and tyrannies to scorn.

(f) So soon as possible, all of us must end the wasteful, inefficient, and usually futile foreign aid programs; which rarely help the recipient nations, as they simultaneously weaken, demoralize, and eventually will bankrupt the Government of the United States and all of its citizens.

(g) We must renew our adherence to the principles of constitutional representative government, as laid down by the Founding Fathers of our 21 sovereign and independent Republics.

(h) Above all, we must reinvigorate, redouble, and rededicate ourselves to our common faith.

Mr. BRADEN (reading) :

While the 21 American Republics always should be alert to and never permit themselves to be victimized by the U.S.S.R.'s economic warfare, it is infinitely more important that Communist inspired and directed subversion and espionage be uncovered and summarily suppressed. This cannot be done effectively so long as the government and social structures of the American Republics too often are weakened and made timid by socialism or any other misguided idealism.

It was just such weakness and timidity which at first prevented the United States from taking positive action to support Col. Castillo Armas in his drive to overthrow the Arbenz Communist regime in Guatemala, to whom we had given foreign aid. Fortunately for all of us, President Somoza of Nicaragua courageously saved the day by supplying arms and planes to Castillo Armas.

Let me interpolate here that President Somoza, when I was Assistant Secretary of State, pulled a coup to put himself back in power after he had been out for only a month and I refused to have his regime recognized. Just as I had had difficulties with Batista when I was Ambassador in Cuba, so that there was no predilection on my part in favor of Somoza. On the contrary, I had my run-ins with him because I opposed any dictatorship of any kind. [Reading further:]

Later a number of Latin American Ambassadors pointed out to the State Department that if the Communists continued to control Guatemala, similar regimes would crop up in other American countries, and that since we were being accused of intervention anyway, we might as well intervene by giving Castillo Armas support, thus saving the situation. At the Ambassador's behest, we added our help to wipe out the first modern Communist government established on this hemisphere. That was a narrow escape. It behooves all the hemisphere to see to it that we don't come so close to a debacle again.

The tragic epilog is that the Communists, in due course, got their revenge through the assassinations of both Castillo Armas and Somoza.

Referring to Bolivia in this speech, I said:

What we have done in Bolivia, if anything, is more shocking than our financing of the Polish and Yugoslav Communists, because we have kept alive a Marxist regime in the very center of what we have called the good neighborhood.

Senator JOHNSTON. I notice you say there you are not in favor of any dictatorship. Neither am I anywhere. But in some of those countries we have got to be on our guard also when we kick out a dictatorship for fear that something much worse than just a dictatorship comes into existence. That is what we have got to watch out for.

Mr. BRADEN. I thoroughly agree with you. As a matter of fact, what I said about Batista proves how much I agree.



I had my difficulties with Batista, but Batista was, if you please, a bad boil or an ulcer, not a malignancy of some kind. An ulcer is bad and disagreeable but now you have a cancer that will kill Cuba. That is the difference then between the ulcer or boil and the cancer.

I have said in this speech and elsewhere:

Juan Lechin, the Communist leader of the mineworkers, while serving as Minister of Mines, declared in a public speech that his government was even more radical than that of the Chinese Communists [sic]. I suggest that that is the ultimate in radicalism.

That is precisely what the new so-called agrarian reform law in Cuba is. It is worse than the Communists ever hoped to get.

Now I observe there that Mr. Herbert Matthews of the New York Times in his article yesterday says it is completely non-Communist in Cuba and that Castro is not a Communist. Nevertheless he makes the same statement I have, viz: That the new Cuban agrarian reform law was so radical that even the Communists did not dare propose it. That is his defense of Castro, just the same kind of defense as Juan Lechin, the Communist leader—who is a Trotskyite, incidentally, not a Stalinist—made in Bolivia. Again reading from my speech:

Now this same [Bolivian] Government which we support so lavishly, came to power by force, including imprisonment, torture, and death for hundreds of opposition leaders and ordinary citizens, who did not happen to belong to the MNR or Communist parties.

Incidentally its first President, Paz Estensoro, during the Second World War, joined a Nazi-inspired conspiracy against the United States and its allies and was denounced officially therefor by the U.S. Government. Hundreds of responsible and reputable Bolivians, who through the years, have proven their friendship for the United States and their anticommunism, have been murdered and tortured, imprisoned and exiled, or compelled to flee for their lives.

Clearly, the Communists activated these demonstrations, just as they did those last year against Vice President Nixon. But State Department and ICA ineptitude also have been factors, plus the waste, extravagance, and corruption with which U.S. foreign aid has been handled.

Communists have been stirring up trouble on an increasing scale throughout the hemisphere. Witness the recent wildcat strike on the Mexican railroads, which that country's attorney general called a Communist plot. Instigating it were two officials of the U.S.S.R. Embassy, plus apparently another couple from a satellite diplomatic mission.

As late as on March 22 Cuba's new Prime Minister Fidel Castro in a speech proclaimed his country's neutralism and protested against the United States of America continuing its naval base at Guantanamo. He declared that aggression against his country did not originate overseas; i.e., from Russia, and that Cuban women and children should be armed to resist attacks that threatened from the beaches of Florida or the Dominican Republic. He observed that the selfishness and exploitation by the great trusts and interests (presumably from the United States) have killed more Cubans than the Batista tyranny.

It becomes relatively unimportant to argue whether Fidel Castro is merely a misguided idealist, an economic charlatan, or that most dangerous kind of dictator, one with a Messianic complex.

Senator JOHNSTON. Why does he tie the Dominican Republic with the United States?

Mr. BRADEN. He claims that we supply the arms. It is true we have got an observation base for our missile project in the Dominican Republic, and he says we are supporting them as he claims we supported Batista.

I have speeches here just within the last week in the official papers there in which Fidel's brother refers to the bombs, the napalm bombs we supplied Batista to drop on his people.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is Raul, says we did.

Mr. BRADEN. Yes, Raul is saying that but Fidel has said the same thing.

Senator JOHNSTON. Don't you think he is doing that for this reason: There is kind of a bitter feeling already between them and the Dominican Republic and then to add in the United States with—

Mr. BRADEN. I think it is far deeper than that. I think it is, and again I go back to this most recent statement—

Senator JOHNSTON. Do you think communism is anywhere in there?

Mr. BRADEN. I think communism is very definitely in it.

I think that Castro's ambition is to be the leader of the entire hemisphere, the American Hemisphere. Raul says just that in a speech he gave a few days ago, that they want to bring all of the Latin American countries together under his leadership.

Mr. SOURWINE. We had a witness who testified very recently—and this man, whom you may have read about, was a former leader, the head of the Cuban Air Force, Maj. Diaz Lanz—that Cuba, especially, and many other Latin American countries, were strongly antidictatorship in their public opinion, and that Castro was using this as a base for fulminating Communist activities throughout Latin America. Does this make sense to you?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes. I think it is partly his own ambition. As I have said, I am not 100 percent positive that Fidel himself is a Communist. That his brother is and that Fidel is surrounded by them, yes.

I come to that very point in the next sentence here.

Senator JOHNSTON. I noticed by the papers in here that he is talking about an election down there.

Mr. BRADEN. Not an election. The newspapers haven't had it in New York yet but the story that I got from Cuban sources was that, No. 1, he wants to go to this foreign ministers' conference in Santiago, Chile, between the 3rd and 10th, I think, of August, and in order to have himself named as Foreign Minister he says, "I will resign as Prime Minister."

That also he has got all of these people coming in from the farms that he alleges he is helping by this agrarian reform act.

Actually he isn't, but he has got them coming in, and he wants to get up and say "I am going to withdraw now" and then he will have them all well organized, and the Communists do organize very well indeed. They will, he hopes, roar their insistence that he stay on as Premier.

I have seen them do things like this in Cuba.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is this your judgment as to why he resigned?

Mr. BRADEN. This is my judgment as to why he would come out with this hocus pocus of resignation.

One, to go to Santiago. Two, to put on an act and have a great demonstration, with crowds yelling: "No; you can't abandon us."

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I think the speech that Raul Castro made, to which the Ambassador has referred, is of sufficient interest that you might wish to order that an English language translation of it be placed in this record.

Senator JOHNSTON. I order that to be done.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you take care of that, Mr. Mandel?

Mr. BRADEN. Well, I will get the speech for you later. Here it is. The parts I have marked in red.



(A translation by the Library of Congress of the Raul Castro speech reads as follows:)

[Révolución, Havana, Cuba, June 30, 1959. pp. 16, 17]

SPEECH OF RAUL CASTRO AT THE OPENING OF THE FIRST FORUM ON LAND REFORM

Major Raúl Castro Ruz:

"Dear Friends and Comrades:

"It is highly symbolical that the First National Forum on the Land Reform is being held in these halls which housed until the first of January that semblance of a Parliament, that intolerable travesty of democracy that the Congress of the Tyranny had been.

"Instead of the corrupt politicians who had debased the democratic representation, there is assembled here tonight, under the roof of what should always be a true Palace of Justice, the genuine representation of the national interests. Convoled by the revolutionary organization, in which the chief authority was vested in the revolutionary process against the tyranny following the appeal of the '26th of July,' so weighted down with glory and responsibilities, there are assembled here representatives of the other revolutionary organizations, and there will assemble here persons from among the producing, technical, and intellectual classes to debate the most important problem of the Revolution: the Land Reform. Here are men of all ideological tendencies, susceptible of being coordinated for giving impulse to the revolution; here are the urban workers, the rural workers, but not, like yesterday, the false 'leaders,' workers contriving to mock democracy of the trade unions, but authentic representatives of that trade union democracy, elected by the workers; not, like yesterday, a handful of big and powerful landholders who were speaking in the name of the rural workers, without the poor farmworkers, who constitute the enormous majority of the rural workers, being able to make themselves heard; but real farmers, men who made the land bear fruit through their direct effort and who yesterday, humiliated and mistreated, were living in the furrows, ousted from their homes by the Rural Guard [Police] and by Justice in the service of the traditional oppressors; without land of their own, suffocated by abusively high rents, with their squalid wives and parasite-ridden children, and who today, as a formidable symbol of the historic meaning of the revolution, have come here to the center of past corruption, to install themselves in the seats yesterday occupied, many times, by the enemies of the people [who were] the tools of lords and landholding companies.

"THE UNDERPRIVILEGED HAVE NOW BECOME THE FOCUS OF NATIONAL ATTENTION

"Nothing is more wonderful, Cubans, than this spectacle! Those who have always been underprivileged have now become the focus of national attention. Those who could not speak—in spite of the continuous, hypocritical talk of democracy—can now, coming from the remotest parts, make their voices heard and speak out fully, freely, directly. The revolutionists, yesterday, persecuted like a pack of mongrels in the cities, searched out in the mountainous regions of Oriente, Las Villas, and Pinar del Rio, and having to defend, rifle in hand, their right to live, are here today as representatives of a revolution that gives liberty even to its enemies. The producing forces and the Revolution have [agreed to] combined [combine] their aspirations and concerns.

"And to bring the symbolic nature of this First Forum into even sharper focus, to define more completely the meaning of our Revolution, the representatives of those social sectors who have impugned the Land Reform, in its totality or in any of its parts, have also been invited to come here, with abundant rights. It was requested that, in debating the chief problem of the revolutionary program, those too should be heard who think—although we do not accept their ideas—that this Reform may entail injustices or inflict harm on the march of our economy. The Revolution is sure of itself, of its planning, of the ideas which it sustains. And because of this certainty, it has agreed to debate, in full view of all the people of Cuba and of the whole world, to defend that program and those objectives. The Revolution belongs to the people, but they do not use it to silence their critics; the Revolution has the might, but it does not need it to defend its laws because it is attended by profound reason [its cause is just] and that is enough; the Revolution has the Power, but it does

not exercise it unlawfully despite its being vested in the majority of [the people of] the country, as all investigations have shown and, above all, the very presence of those people at each revolutionary function; it does not exercise it unlawfully, I repeat, so as to exclude from the debates those who have something to object to or something to oppose.

"This function has also other meanings which I would not wish to overlook.

"WE SHALL GO TO THE ELECTIONS [POLLS] WHEN THE PEOPLE WANT THEM

"Those who have hypocritically wanted to accuse the Revolution of its lack of 'legality,' those who are calling out frantically for the revolutionary process to be 'institutionalized,' and who therefore would want the Revolution to dissolve on the very morrow its revolutionary organs and to return to the former political setup, said that is lacking now is what they call 'the august majesty of the Parliament.' Well, then, it is necessary to say, as our Commander-in-Chief and Leader, Fidel Castro Ruz, has said so many times, that, as soon as the people so want, the Revolution will organize the elections which give normal institutional form to that enormous, historical transformation that we are bringing about; but it is also necessary to tell the whole truth. And the whole truth is that in this sumptuous Capitol, erected by an abominable tyranny for concealment behind its marble walls, behind the solemn statutes, behind the gold and the pomp, there obtains the lack of the people's rights and liberties; in this Parliamentary Palace it has been necessary—and not in time of tyranny but in so-called normal times—that the Presidents of the Republic paid fabulous sums and granted inalterable prebends to attain the approval of a law that would benefit the nation. Today, in contrast thereto, we are meeting here, with abundant rights, to discuss the most profoundly beneficial of all of the laws approved under the Republic, and this law was made by men who, after exposing their lives to the hazardous conditions of clandestine combat or mountain fighting, are giving the best of their abilities and of their skill, and the best of their considered judgment, for the benefit and progress of the majorities, of the people, who are the true foundation of the Cuban nation.

"With this spirit we are starting today the debates of the First Forum on Land Reform.

"It has been said, and I have repeated it more than once, that the Land Reform is the fundamental law of the Revolution and, I must reiterate, the most important of the entire Republican process.

"Why?

"To demonstrate this is the purpose of this forum. But I would not wish, in opening the meeting, to refer again to questions which should be posed without letup, to smash with the weight of the reason and serenity of our arguments, the many miserable calumnies, fallacies, and lies that are being spread by our enemies.

"The eyes of the whole world—and we say this with pride but without boasting—have been fixed in recent months on our beautiful and small island.

"First came the epic revolution, the wonderful process by which 12 lone men, with the support of an entire population, with the collaboration of workers, professionals, intellectuals, businessmen, who love their country, defied and destroyed what appeared an invincible Army with its abominable methods of crime and terror.

"Afterwards, as of the first of January, the attention of the world focused on our country to observe the development of a revolution that had tackled the formidable tasks of transforming the economic backwardness into progress, wretchedness into social justice, national subordination into independence.

"Comrade Fidel Castro defined this revolution by saying that 'it is as Cuban as the palm trees.'

"And, truly, this revolution surges forth like the palm trees from [the soil of] our wounded land, from its needs; and it rises like the palm trees to the limits of our limpid Cuban sky.

"THE CUBAN REVOLUTION SERVES AS AN EXAMPLE FOR OTHER COUNTRIES

"But the wretchedness is not Cuban [alone]; it extends to almost all corners of the globe.

"The social injustice is not Cuban [alone]; it prevails in many parts of the world.

"The concentration of land in the hands of a few is not Cuban [alone]; unfortunately we encounter it in many parts of the world.

"The tyranny is not Cuban [alone]; it lodges in many cubicles in more than one country of our continent.

"It is not strange, therefore, that this Cuban revolution should be unfolding at the same time and under similar circumstances as many other arduous struggles of the peoples.

"Precisely this is alluded to in the preamble to the Land [Reform] Act. It says there how the various United Nations studies have found [arrived at the conclusion] that in many countries the social and economic distribution of the land is a tremendous obstacle to economic progress, and so the phenomena of the economy and of the social life, although they have their specific and distinct peculiarities in each country, also have their inevitable concomitants.

"In the economic terminology of the World War II postwar era a certain term, 'underdeveloped countries,' has become fashionable.

"Underdeveloped countries means a whole category of countries whose characteristics are economic backwardness, lack of industrialization, the predominantly agrarian nature of their economies, dependence on foreign markets for [their] development as well as imports.

"Almost all those countries also have one thing in common; not the free determination of the peoples, but the imposition of foreign factors has prevailed in them. Many times that foreign imposition has been [of a] direct, ostensible, indisputable [nature]. In their majority, the underdeveloped countries are colonies, or old colonial countries unequivocally dominated by a foreign power for decades and sometimes for hundreds of years.

"In other cases, the foreign denomination was effected covertly, by way of economic penetration, occupancy of the key post of the country's economy, control of the land, and of the banking and credit system.

"Cuba, as we know full well, has been languishing under both kinds during the last fifty years.

"In 1902, when the Lone-Star Flag was hoisted on the Morro for the first time, Máximo Gómez and the veterans from the bottom of their hearts gave expression to hope and expectation and said, 'We have arrived.'

"But, unfortunately, they had not arrived.

"Because Cuba was born under the symbol of dependency. The patriots attending the Assembly of 1901 had been unable to prevent that a foreign power imposed on us the Amendment that impaired the extent of our sovereignty. But, in addition, at that very moment the economic penetration was being brought about that had been foreseen by José Martí. We began to depend on a single foreign market, and the territorial riches that are the basis of true independence began to slip out of our hands.

"Then, under the umbrella of the Amendment, the misnamed Reciprocity Treaty of 1903 was made, by which our country, in exchange for exports of sugar, small quantities of tobacco, and a few other agricultural products, sacrificed—or was forced to sacrifice—all perspectives of economic development.

#### "PEOPLE WHO BUY, COMMAND; PEOPLE WHO SELL, OBEY

"The fate of our country began to be sealed in a negative way. José Martí had said, 'A country that commits its future to a single product is a country of slaves.'<sup>1</sup> And to Cuba had been assigned a single product on which to build its future. José Martí had said, 'People who buy, command; people who sell, obey.'

"And in its relations with a neighbor, whom Maceo qualified already at century's end as 'powerful' Cuba was given the role of seller of its chief production, and thus tied to him by the strongest bonds of economic domination.

"Therefore it is not strange that for more than half a century as a Republic, Cuba has found itself included among the countries falling into the general category of 'underdeveloped.'

"And the underdevelopment, the backwardness, the impairment of sovereignty, are what have engendered in Cuba, as in the rest of Latin America and in other parts of the world, the revolutionary aspirations and also—as instruments of those who want to maintain their domination, their power, their oppression—the tyranny.

<sup>1</sup> Or, "People who . . . are a people of . . ."—Translator.



"José Martí—the most farsighted leader and most inspired politician of the Americas during the second half of the last century—knew full well that behind what he called 'the lugubrious Paraguay of France and the frightened 'cattle' [slaves] of Ventimilla,' that is to say, behind the American tyrannies, was the territorial feudalism, the domination of a few powerful landholders who were the American replica of European Feudalism in new circumstances [in a modern setting].

"Therefore, the Cuban patriots of 1895, under the leadership of Martí and Maceo, aspired to something more than liberation from Spain. They wanted to bring about economic and social changes here [in Cuba], in accord with the exigencies of the times.

"Martí knew, and said so, that the concentration of land in the hands of a few not only engendered injustice, inequality, and distress, but that it also caused permanent political upheavals. That is why Martí and Maceo wanted that Cuba, having been born with freedom and independence, should be born also without territorial feudalism.

"We have not come here to make history. We shall not examine the [individual] phases of the entire process that leads us to the present.

"But it is an undeniable fact that the program of the revolution of 1895 could not be accomplished. We were born with 'half a freedom,' as has been repeated so many times by Comrade Fidél Castro. We were born with an economic rope—in Trade Agreement form—around our neck. And very quickly the Cuban economy became deformed [crippled].

"By denouncing these things, we men of this Revolution are registering, in reality, a denunciation which has been accumulating over the last thirty years.

"By rolling up our sleeves to proceed to the necessary changes, we men of this Revolution are putting into practice an aspiration which has been sustained during the past few decades.

"Fidél Castro said that the tenth of March 1952 was not an historic accident, but an historic consequence. And that is the truth.

"Batista fell upon the Power not only like an ambitious criminal but, also, as the implementor of a policy, the policy of those who saw with fear that the Cuban people could no longer stand the situation as it was developing and that they were ready to extricate themselves from the economic and social bonds of underdevelopment; and that they would have to be given the complete independence and sovereignty which they had not enjoyed heretofore.

"Cuba wanted to do this in 1930 and couldn't finish what it had set out to do, just as it had been unable to do so in 1895.

"But one cannot keep the road closed to the countries [forever].

"THOSE WHO WANT TO APPLY A BRAKE TO THE REVOLUTION SHOULD  
DO SOME MEDITATING

"Those dreaming today of interrupting the revolutionary process, those willing to resort to every means to impede our country's liberty, those preparing expeditions, having recourse to dynamite and gunfire, joining up with foreign tyrannies and preferring to have the land in which they were born destroyed rather than losing their unjust privileges, should meditate on the course of history. In its pages they will learn that eventually the countries do find their way, no matter how many obstacles are placed in their path. In 1923, the first unrest, because of the backwardness and the lack of sovereignty of the countries, emerged in the University and in the factories. It seemed to have been dispelled, but they reemerged, with renewed impetus, in 1930. Machado had promised the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the North American investors that there could not be a single strike in Cuba; Machado had already at that time raised the 'Communist' spectre, to fight the workers and the people; but he was unseated several years later by an uncontrollable strike.

"In 1935 the revolution seemed to have collapsed; but in 1940 the inexorable revolutionary process wrote into the Constitution democratic and progressive principles which served our people as a means for pushing forward to the future.

"Some believed that if many of the proposals of the 1930 revolution were removed from the Constitution, the revolutionary process would come to an end; but in 1952, in order to prevent the people from making headway, tyranny and crime had again to be resorted to; but neither the tyranny nor the crime sufficed to do the job; in spite of the support from the outside, in spite of the 500 to 1,000

pound bombs manufactured in the United States, in spite of the diplomacy and the double-cross, Cuba was with thousands of victims inexorably forging ahead on the road to the future.

"And we are here today to debate on the program of the Revolution.

"The Land Reform is its fundamental law.

#### "NATURE AND CHARACTER OF THE LAND REFORM ACT

"But if we look into the historic circumstances surrounding the evolution of this Revolution, we will understand its nature and its character.

"Although we were born in 1902 with a mutilated ['half an. '] independence, and although, in spite of our patriotic zeal, we could never attain that independence definitively; although Cuba's aspirations have always been interfered with; although foreign representatives [representatives of foreign countries] more than once have claimed the right to decide our destiny; although they are talking in the United States Congress today as though the Platt Amendment were still in existence and Cuba were an appendix of other countries—the first and noblest objective of this Revolution, as our Comrade Fidél Castro has said over and over again, is the definitive establishment of Cuba's sovereignty. Anyone who says that the Cuban Revolution is hostile to any nation of the world is falsifying the facts. Cuba wants the friendship of all countries. Cuba feels no enmity against any other country. Cuba aspires to live in fraternal understanding with all its neighbors—close and distant, powerful and weak, big and small.

"But Cuba wants to do so as master of its own destiny, with equal rights and obligations.

"As the Revolutionary Government said in the Note with which its Prime Minister, Dr. Roa, answered the objections of the U.S. State Department to the Land Reform, the determination on how the economy should be organized, how the wealth should be distributed, how our agriculture should be [taken care of?] is entirely the concern of *Cuba*. We listen to everybody; we respect the interests of everybody, so long as they are legitimate and respectable. *But we make our own decisions, in accordance with our interests, with the needs of Cuba with the consent of the Cuban people.*

"That is, I would say, the first and most important characteristic of our Revolution.

#### "CUBA IS ATTENDING FOR THE FIRST TIME TO THE NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE

"So that the Revolution may be as we want it to be, it must be given our know-how, the vigor of our land sprung from the bowels of this earth of ours, carved into the world panorama, open to all tendencies (no country can live isolated). Cuba is now listening for the first time to the heartbeats of its people, to the needs of its people, to the decisions of its people.

"But the independence of our country will never become complete unless it is based on economic liberation. And, in this modern world, economic freedom means agrarian diversification, industrialization, the breaking up of commercial monopolies—all that which prophetically had been forecast by the genius of José Martí; all that which, in order to make it a reality, must be based in Cuba on a complete transformation of the land ownership system, on the Land Reform; and, along with it, as point of departure, on the Reform of the Customs System that protects our incipient industries; on the Tax Reform, shortly to be adopted by the Government and geared to economic development; and on the Reform of the Educational System, which will draw technicians, men and women capable of helping with their modern know-how and ability, toward that total transformation which will convert the backward Island into the country of progress, as expressed in Martí's motto, 'with all and for the good [welfare] of all.'

"And that country could not be based on any other than the democratic form of government, because democracy is in reality the government of the people and for the people. Democracy is not, as Fidél Castro pointed out on his trip to the United States, an empty word which serves the hypocrites as a protective shield in order to exploit cheap manpower, to rob other people and other countries. Democracy cannot mean wealth for a handful ['for the few'] and poverty for the largest number of people ['for the many']. Democracy cannot mean privileges for the men of one race, and inequality and oppression for the men and women whose skin is of a different color. Democracy cannot live in any

'anti-ism,' [sic] but must be based on the satisfaction of all the needs of the people, on all the rights of the people, on respect for all ideas, so long as those ideas are not an instrument for going, precisely, against the people, equality and liberty; because those who advocate the return to the old times, those who in the name of liberty make ready for the betrayal of liberty, those who stand on their supposed rights to abolish, later on, all the rights of others—those people cannot be democrats nor do they deserve to enjoy the protection of democracy.

"OUR REVOLUTION IS DEMOCRATIC, INDEPENDENT"

"Those who praise Hitler and defend Franco cannot rise up in the name of democracy to impugn the revolution, or to demand that the rights and freedoms of other groups and other individuals be impaired.

"Therefore—democratic, independent, patriotic, designed to save our country from political enslavement and economic backwardness; designed to lift our citizens out of poverty and unemployment to fruitful work, made a reality, in addition, with the cooperation and common impulse of all those who want that program, urged on by the farmers [rural workers] who have come down with us from the Sierra, with the effort put forth by the [urban] workers who have always given us their courageous support, with the cooperation of the professionals, intellectuals, and artists, of the employees and of all those middle-class groups who in Cuba carry enormous political weight, and backed up, furthermore, by the industrialists who will at last understand the needs of the nation and the meaning of our time—therefore, the Cuban revolution is 'by all [the people] and for the good of all [the people].'

"This is the general framework which embraces the deep meaning of the Land Reform.

"Why is it that the Revolution has considered the Land Reform the first and most important of its laws?

"I believe that it is not anticipating the conclusions of this Forum, although it has become a generally accepted fact, when we answer this question by saying that, without this Land Reform, there would be no economic independence, no industrial progress, no social well-being in our country.

"The figures, with their cold logic, are so eloquent that nobody has dared to voice opposition against the Land Reform, and its merit is so evident that those who want to destroy it have found no other way of doing it than by pretending that they accept it, tampering with it, and then, by changing it here and there, making modifications which they call 'secondary,' dulling its keen edge, emasculating its content, eliminating its revolutionary spirit, in order thus to make it insipid. That is why Fidél has the support of all revolutionists, of all farmers [rural workers], of all the people, when he displays that firmness, which many want to portray as obstinacy, in his refusal to modify any of the principles on which the first, as to importance, of our revolutionary laws has been supported.

"What does the language of figures convey?

"The statistics clearly evidence the enormous land concentration which has up to now existed in our Island.

"As the governments have heretofore been, precisely, in the hands of those landholders, the non-existence until today of even a single statistical table compiled on the basis of land ownership is available. But looking at how the farms are organized and the [number of] units under cultivation is enough to give us an approximate idea of the concentration of land ownership, which is, however, more difficult.

"FIGURES OF UNFAIR LAND DISTRIBUTION"

"Of the alleged 159,000 farms in existence in Cuba, which approximate 676,000 caballerías<sup>2</sup> of land, 20 percent, or 32,000 farms, cover only a surface of 6,410 caballerías of land, or less than one percent of the total farm expanse. The average size of these 32,000 farms covers one-fifth caballería of land.

"There are another 30,000 farms, some 19 percent, comprising 15,700 caballerías, or 2.32 percent of the land under cultivation, none of which comprises as much as one caballería of land. The average size is one-half caballería of land per farm.

<sup>2</sup> One "caballería" equals 13.42 hectares (in Cuba).—Translator.



"This means that 39 percent of all farms, or 52,500, occupy only 3.27 percent of the total farm area. The actual situation is even more clearly perceptible when we point out that 157,000 farms, or almost 99 percent of Cuba's farm total, cover only a surface of 359,000 caballerías of land, or 53 percent of the total area.

"Let us now take a look at the other extreme of the distribution of the farms. There are in all of Cuba only 788 farms of between 75 and 372 caballerías of land, or one-half percent of the total; this small number of farms, in turn, covers a surface of 107,000 caballerías of land, or 16 percent of the total.

"But even more ominous is the fact that only 114 farms occupy among themselves a total of 135,000 caballerías of land, or 20 percent of the total farm area; 114 landholder estates have a larger acreage total than do 100,000 small farms; and one-third of the entire farm acreage is held by only 894 individuals or companies.

"But are, perchance, those tiny farms, those real 'minifundios,' on which nobody can make a living and which constitute a mortgage on the entire economic progress of the country, operated by landowners?

"Absolutely not. Only 30 percent of the persons engaged in agricultural activities in Cuba are landowners. Very few of the rural workers are landowners.

"When the Agricultural Act was put into effect, or to be exact, several years ago when the last census was taken, there were in our country:

"46,000 tenant farmers

"6,987 sub-tenant farmers

"33,000 sharecroppers

"13,000 squatters.

"One hundred thousand persons engaged in agricultural activities had no land of their own.

"This was, in general terms, the status of the Cuban land situation when the Revolution began its reform activities.

"What were the social consequences of this situation, as reflected in the statistics? They could only be poverty in the social, and backwardness in the economic sector.

"It has been said of Cuba, as of other countries, that along with people without land there was land without people.

"Hundreds of thousands of farmers have not owned any land until now.

"Additional tens of thousands, as has been seen, have so little land that it is not enough for the support of their families.

"There was a group of Camaguey landholders who stated that the land that was left to them [by the landholders?] was not enough to be buried in. And I ask myself: If a hundred caballerías of land in some cases, and 30 caballerías in the worst cases, is not enough for those gentlemen to be buried in, how are 150,000 'guajiros' [tenant farmers, etc.] going to manage to live off a piece of land which, in the majority of cases, comprises not even half a caballería of land?

"That is why the standard of living of our farmers has been so wretched, so unreasonably low.

#### "THE GOVERNMENT IS FULFILLING THE PLEDGE MADE IN THE SIERRA

"I am not going to describe here the extent of that poverty. Until the first of January there were thousands of Cubans, city-dwellers, who had not been concerned, or who had not been taught to be concerned, over the atrocious state of our farmlands. Now it has become known how our 'guajiros' are actually living; those of us who have shared their fate, those of us who have received, under the gunfire of the Army of the Tyranny, or under the bombs dropped by the air force, which was done in order 'to save democracy,' protection by those generous Cuban farmers—we have made—and are fulfilling—the solemn pledge that the Revolution would not rest until it would bring to the fertile and beautiful fields of our Island the happiness of which they had been deprived by the landholders, by the foreign companies, and by the treacherous and anti-patriotic governments.

"Those who like to deal in conjectures have talked for years about our country's progress, referring, as evidence thereof, to the increase in the 'per capita income' figures which, it appears, are higher in Cuba than in many [other Latin] American countries.

"But economic statistics are one thing, and another, very different thing is the terrible reality of the facts.

"The 'per capita' [income] in Cuba is said to be about 400 pesos [dollars]. Accordingly, a typical farm family—that is to say, a family of six—should receive an annual income of 2,400 pesos [dollars]. And I ask anyone who has visited Cuba's interior whether he knows many rural families making more than 800 pesos a year; whether he does not know thousands of families who do not receive that income, taking into account, for instance, the prices at which the stores of the monopoly-holders sell to them, in exchange for the pittance paid to them for their tobacco or foodstuffs, the pieces of material [for clothing], the shoes, the vital necessities of family life.

"The University's Catholic Youth has made a study of the average income of agricultural workers. I believe that nobody would accuse the University's young Catholic Youth of being 'Communists'—as is the custom in such cases. Well, then, the study shows that the average income of a family of six in those cases is 45 pesos a month, which includes all income; that is to say, inclusive of—and accounted for—the foodstuffs which they themselves had grown. Thus we find that an agricultural worker has to eat, clothe, and feed himself, buy medicine for himself, go to the village, on only six pesos a month. Those of us who had been welcomed into the homes of those agricultural workers know what these figures represent in terms of poverty, grief, humiliation, and sadness—humiliation and sadness reflected in the faces of their children, in the faded looks of their young girls, in the furrowed brow of the peasant mother.

"That is why now, for the first time, we have seen a ray of hope in the faces of our country-folk.

"The primary reason for making the Land Reform imperative is one of simple social justice.

#### "THE LAND REFORM IS A CAUSE OF SIMPLE SOCIAL JUSTICE

"How is it possible to think of a revolutionary situation that would not correct such terrible social inequality? Do those who oppose the Land Reform, in that it tends to vindicate the farmer [rural worker, or peasant], in that it entails redistribution of wealth, think that the situation described won't be able to prosper, even less that someday a giant outburst of rage would occur here? Do those gentlemen believe that the Cuban farmer is going to stand, passively and forever, for that inhuman penury which has converted him into a veritable sub-human beast, beyond the reach of civilization? What our Revolution is realizing in an orderly, peaceful manner, through laws and debates, would have been brought about by all those thousands, hundreds of thousands, of victims of intolerable underprivilege very shortly and in every way.

"When I see the objections being made by the North American press against the Land Reform; when I see and read that it calls it 'Communist' because it [the Reform] is going to distribute the land to those who have none or who have some, and because it is going to deprive of the land (making compensation for it, of course) those who have too much and who do not make adequate use of it, I ask myself what those gentlemen are thinking of our [Latin] American countries; because I see them concerned because there, in their own country, they have four million unemployed and seven million under-employed; I see them concerned because the income of the workers has dropped there—and four million unemployed are not more than three percent of the population; whereas here, 10 percent of the population are out of work, and almost 50 percent of the population, that is to say, the rural workers and their families, live in conditions worse than any unemployed urban worker of the United States. And I ask myself: Do the political leaders, the union leaders of organizations such as the AFofL of the United States, believe that they can continue to live in a world in which their own well-being [prosperity] the opulence of some of them, the social security of their country, is going to result in the backwardness, poverty, and insecurity of millions of men and women in Latin America who are living enfeoffed on lands of the United Fruit Co., the American Sugar Co., the Francisco Sugar Co., on Braden's mining properties, on Mr. Clayton's cotton lands, on the petroleum claims of the Standard Oil Co.?

"To give the farmers the status of human dignity in a land in which José Martí wanted the first law of the Republic to be the respect for the full dignity of man; to transform the pariah into a person, that is why the Land Reform was made in the first place.



"But you gentlemen attending this Forum, you know full well; you Comrades, you know full well that the transcendence of the Land Reform does not stop here, because the social backwardness of the farm population has been translated into economic backwardness as regards the Republic, and for two main reasons, which are fully explained by the 'Whereases' of the Land [Reform] Act.

"A country's industry needs markets—foreign markets for exports, or [and] domestic markets.

"TO FACILITATE THE LIGHT INDUSTRY BY EXPANDING THE DOMESTIC MARKET

"Cuba's export industries, sugar and tobacco, for example, hold their own in the foreign markets. If Cuba were to produce only the 350 tons that are consumed domestically, there would be no possibility here for a sugar industry; but we cannot aspire to an industry geared solely to exports. Cuba's light industry must be, chiefly, an industry designed for domestic consumption. Cuban leather goods, Cuban textiles, the Cuban food industry, Cuban cigarettes, the Cuban soft drink industry, for example, cannot aspire, for the moment, to compete in foreign markets with industries with greater experience, higher technical levels, larger economic resources such as the North American, British, Czechoslovak, or German industries.

"In order to develop its industries Cuba must have an internal [domestic], Cuban, market, and there can be no Cuban market if half the population of Cuba, that is to say, the small farmers [peasants] and agricultural workers, live in abject poverty.

"For example, Cuba's present-day footwear industry has a production capacity of almost 30 million pairs of shoes of every type. Yet, it must be inactive much of the year and, because there is no market, only 14 to 16 million pairs of shoes are produced.

"When, through the Land Reform, all Cuban farmers will have an adequate income, the footwear industry, the cigar industry, the textile and garment industry, the canning industry, all of these will prosper. Thousands of workers will go to work. This is how the Land Reform will help to fight unemployment, not only converting thousands of unemployed rural folk into land-owners, not only giving work to other thousands of rural workers, but also developing the industries and giving jobs in those industries to unemployed workers in the city.

"And like a snow-ball, which grows by its own force, raising the standard of living in the cities will make it possible for the rural folk to receive better prices for their products, to sell more, to increase production.

"This will be one of the formidable effects of the Land Reform, but that is not the end of its economic effects.

"IT WILL PROMOTE THE INCREASE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN THE COUNTRY

"Because, besides placing at the disposal of industry new agricultural raw materials, thereby saving foreign exchange, the [Land] Reform will also promote the increase of our agricultural production, making it possible for Cuba to become self-sufficient in the food sectors and saving us more than 150 million dollars in foreign exchange which could be used in the future to expand the country's industrial structure, that is to say, to push the economic development.

"If we were to believe the North American newspapers, there is enormous concern in the United States because owing to the Land Reform, Cuba's agricultural production is going to drop.

"It is regrettable that the concern over Cuba's agricultural production did not start earlier, half a century ago, when the North American companies began to control the best Cuban lands, because Cuba's agricultural production on January 1, 1959, was in a lamentable state.

"Though its soil is among the most fertile in the whole world, Cuba must import 5.5 million quintals of rice, 110 million lb. of potatoes, more than 10 million lb. of kidney beans. All that is costing us approximately 200 million dollars, when we include fats and oils.

"Why is all this happening? Well, because the 'latifundio' [big landholders] has deformed [crippled] the Cuban economy, because the big companies and big 'latifundistas' [landholders] have not been concerned with what is best for our country, but that it produces for them what is most profitable for them.

"Furthermore, because the average poor peasant, impoverished by the landholders, always threatened with evacuation, hounded for the payment of rent, has been unable to introduce agricultural improvements, one can well understand that a peasant is not much concerned over stepping up or diversifying his production, as he knows that the Rural Guards [police] may come at any moment to drive him off the farm without the owner paying him for the improvements that he may have introduced there.

"One can also understand that the small farmer, who must give his landlord 30, 40, and up to 50 percent of the harvest, has no interest in expanding it beyond certain limits—arguments which we remember also having read in the formidable brief prepared by the present Prime Minister Comrade Fidél Castro, [and read] in his discourse [plea] before a [military?] tribunal and compiled in a pamphlet entitled 'La Historia me absolverá' [History will acquit me].

"The devastating effects of 'latifundio' had already been stigmatized in the days of the Roman Empire, by Plinius.

"In Cuba, historians, not radicals like Ramiro Guerra who is now looking for the 'flaws' in the Land Reform with the zeal of certain newspapers who are against the Reform, had denounced the evils of 'latifundism' over thirty years ago.

#### "QUESTIONS FOR THOSE WHO PREDICT DROP IN PRODUCTION

"It would be a good idea if those in the United States and Cuba who are now concerned over a possible drop in Cuba's 'agricultural productivity,' were to answer the following questions:

"Why and how come that they were not concerned before, when the sugar industry kept over 100,000 caballerías of land inactive needed by our country for the diversification of its production?

"Why and how come that they were not concerned over the average sugar cane output in Cuba's agriculture being not more than 40,000 arrobas<sup>3</sup> per caballería, when there are countries with twice and even three times that output?

"Why haven't they been concerned over the low cereals output?

"How come that they did not make an effort to help Cuba so that, instead of using 296,000 caballerías of land for grazing land for four or five million head of livestock, with a ridiculous average of 13 head per caballería, we would step up the productivity of the cattle-raising industry to come up to the levels of the United States, Uruguay, and other livestock-raising countries, whereby we might release another 100,000 caballerías for agricultural development?

"It has to be suspected that all that sudden love, all that unexpected interest in Cuba's agricultural production, is a screen for concealing nothing else but their concern over the measures of the Government designed to take out of the hands which until now have had control, to the detriment of agricultural progress, of the 250,000 caballerías of land which are henceforth going to increase our production.

"And I believe that this Land [Reform] Forum, upon studying the problem of agricultural production, is going to agree with the Reform technicians and experts, that its consequence, far from causing a drop in our agricultural production, will be, very shortly, a general increase in Cuba's agricultural production. I know that the INRA leaders have already worked in that direction and with that spirit [objective]. I hope that they will demonstrate to the Forum, with their scientific education [know-how], what I am tracing only in general outlines insofar as my imperfect knowledge of those matters permits.

"It is obvious that if some unlawfully keep the agricultural wealth [for themselves], they take a mutinous attitude against the Reform and against the Government; that if those heretofore in charge of agricultural production make use of their positions to sabotage the Reform, to refuse to promote planting, not to clean the cane sugar or abandon the fields, to neglect the seeds, etc., a momentary drop [in production] could be caused which not only would do the country no good but which would be terrible for everybody.

"However, that would not be a natural consequence of the Reform, but [an act of] sabotage and against such sabotage the Revolution has the possibility of taking many economic, social and legal measures. For example, when the big livestock people of Camaguey were said to plan obscure [underhanded] maneuvers to prevent the consumption of meat from continuing its normal pace, Prime Minister Fidél Castro ordered intervention [government control] on cattle

<sup>3</sup> One *arroba* equals one quarter or 11.5 kilograms; as a liquid measure, one *arroba* equals about four gallons.

ranches covering a surface of over 100 caballerías, that is to say, [a total of] over 70,000 caballerías of land, and arrangements were made for meat cattle to be brought to those grazing lands, to guarantee the population of our country, for its regular consumption, the meat to which it has a right.

"THE REVOLUTION WILL PREVENT DROP IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

"The Revolution will also find the necessary means of preventing the production in other branches of agriculture from dropping, because of political reasons, because of resistance [opposition] to the fully justified Land Reform, which is supported and sustained by all the people of Cuba.

"That faith in the possibility of maintaining and raising the level of agricultural productivity is what led our Comrade Fidél Castro, to offer, in the name of the Government, officially to the Government of the United States, eight million tons of sugar for the coming years; and we are sure that Cuba will not only maintain but also raise, at a more and more rapid pace, [the level of] its agricultural production.

"We have said that the people support the Reform. But we don't have to say that the Reform has enemies.

"I don't intend to make an exhaustive examination here into what the opposition to the Land Reform consists of, precisely because this Forum, which we are inaugurating today, is being held in order to answer in depth the objections formulated in various camps against this law of the Revolution, which is of capital importance. But, nevertheless, I want to say something about that which has come to my mind in reading and hearing certain criticisms.

"THE CATTLEMEN WILL NOT SUFFER BY THE LAND REFORM ACT

"I have heard talk, for example, in the name of the cattlemen, against the Land [Reform] Act, and I have had to ask myself: What cattlemen could oppose the Act? Why?

"I have gone over the livestock statistics—not in radical publications but in sources acceptable to even the most conservative elements—and found this, which I want to explain not only [sic] to the Forum—which, because of its composition, I do not have to enlighten in matters of this kind—but to public opinion in Cuba.

"In our country, there are, officially, 89,934, i.e., some 90,000 cattle ranches [farms on which livestock is kept], 38,000 of which have less than nine head of cattle; another 37,000 have less than 50 head of cattle; another 7,500 have up to 100 head of cattle; and another 5,000 have up to 250 head of cattle.

"All these arms when added together total 87,000, out of a grand total of 89,000. This means to say that 87,000 cattle ranches [or farms on which livestock is kept], or 98 percent of all cattle ranches of the Republic, will in no way suffer by the Land Reform, from the viewpoint of their expansion.

"Why? Well, because all of these 87,000 farms may, with 30 caballerías of land, include all the livestock they now have on their pastures and, greatly step up production.

"As for the remaining 2,000 farms, it is possible to state that almost all of them, save for fewer than 200, may be included in the exemption which permits [the use of] up to 100 caballerías of land for certain forms [types] of cattle-raising.

"This means to say that 88,000 of the 89,000 cattlemen [cattle ranchers] of Cuba should have nothing to say against the Land [Reform] Act, and should, indeed, have much to say in its favor. Because anyone who knows the agriculture of Cuba, knows only too well that many thousands of cattlemen, who have up to now been tenant farmers and sharecroppers are very shortly going to be transformed into [property] owners.

"Who, then, are the operators opposing it?

"To tell you the truth, barely a handful of big wheels in the cattle business.

"We cannot take their right to oppose it away from them, but, as they said in the Brazilian Parliament, in courteous, parliamentary language, they might be told:

"Gentlemen, you have reason [to object?], but you don't have much reason, and the little you have isn't worth much."

"Because it is a selfish reason.



"The cattlemen have always been the true foundation of the Cuban livestock industry. I believe that this matter will be examined in depth by the Forum.

"The livestock men are the modest cattle ranchers, the 70-odd thousand who have less than 50 head of cattle each.

"At the other extreme have been the all-powerful meat-cattle raisers.

"The power and the concentration of these groups in the livestock industry can be appreciated when one knows that, while 80,000 small cattlemen have, among them alone, a million head of cattle, 335 big cattlemen have, among themselves alone, six or five thousand [65 thousand?] head of cattle; or, 15 head per farm in one case, and 2,000 [200?] head per owner in the other.

"If those figures reflect an economic advance on the part of large-scale cattle-raising, they would be defensible.

"But what brought about the examination of the livestock industry is that the big cattlemen depend on the extensive, underdeveloped breed of cattle [or sub-standard cattle?], that they waste the Cuban soil, that, because of them and their landholdings, Cuba is using about 100,000 caballerias of land more than is needed for the present livestock production.

"That is to say, not only is there wretched poverty for the majority of cattlemen but also backwardness for [underdevelopment of] the national economy.

"What we said about the cattlemen we could repeat with respect to the [sugar] planters.

"It is true that the planters have, in this case, taken a more moderate and reasonable position than the cattlemen, which in large measure reflects the fact that, while the big planters of yesterday no longer dominate to the same extent as before the Association which represents the planters, in turn, those who speak in the name of the cattle-raising industry are, as we can see, the big wheel cattlemen.

"Logic, technical considerations, and justice recommend [are on the side of] the Land Reform which we have made a reality; but it continues to be attacked.

"Much has been said already about the famous 'poor widow.' Under the measures promised by the Fidél, I don't believe anyone will continue to resort to that lacrimose demagoguery.

"Those generous gentlemen of today are comparable to that opulent Juan de Robres, big wheel exploiter of Old Spain, who, after bleeding the country folk white, built a hospital and ordered the following sign put up:

" 'This hospital was made [built] by Mr. Juan de Robres,' below which some joker had written: 'And he also made the poor'.

"We have many of the Juan de Robres type who now weep with the poor whom they themselves had made poor.

"Many who are moved by the poverty that they never knew how to prevent, and who are searching in the fine print of the law for some marginal disadvantage that it might entail for a humble person, exhibit it as example of the 'atrociousness' of this measure [Land Reform Act].

"The people distrust those belated [Johnny-come-lately] benefactors.

"It so happens that, according to the North American press, there are sugar companies that would now be willing to put their idle lands into production. And we should ask ourselves: Why did they wait 50 years before they realized that this would have to happen? Really, it is difficult to believe in the good intentions of those proponents [people who make such propositions].

"On the other hand, some also saw fit to attack the Act by saying that it goes against the right to [own] 'property'; and that it is, in that sense, a 'Communist' law.

"These are strange combat tactics.

"THE UNITED STATES PRESS FIGHTS THE LAW WITH PRETEXTS, NOT REASONS

"All of a sudden I [happened to] read a number of the New York Times and found in it that the Law goes against the Communists because it makes [creates?] small landholders.

"The two arguments, devised by the same sectors, contradict each other.

"Likewise, the big cattlemen have come out and accused the government of being more radical than the Communists.

"Who can figure it out?

"[The fact of the matter] is that they are not looking for reasons, but for pretexts.

"How is a law going to go [be directed] against property when it will turn 250,000 Cubans, who never had anything, into owners of an equivalent of [approximately] two caballerías of land?

"The law is neither Communist nor anti-Communist.

"It is a law which satisfies the needs of the country. It is supported by the Communists: but it is also supported by Bishop Díaz and Father Biain. This does not make it either Communistic or Catholic. If the Catholics and the Communists coincide in giving it their approval, it [the reason] is because it must be very good for many people, in very different camps. It must, therefore, be good for Cuba. It is made [directed] neither against the Americans nor against the Communists but, as Fidél Castro said some time ago and repeated again in Camaguey, 'against poverty.'

"It would be wrong to say that, although the law will affect many rich people, this Revolution goes [is directed] against the rich people.

"Fidél has made this clear, too, many times, in the name of the Revolution.

"This Revolution is [has been] made a reality so that Cuba will advance.

"Not all forms of wealth help Cuba to advance.

"This has been said many times by those who have studied the Cuban problem from the economic or sociological viewpoint.

"The wealth of landownership, the large holdings of livestock, are forms of wealth condemned already in the 1930's by all students [of the problem]; it brings to mind the book, 'Problems of New Cuba,' published by the Foreign Policy Association; nor has the 'Report on Cuba,' despite its conservatism, been able to approve those forms of wealth.

"Usurious wealth has been condemned universally.

"Every examination of Cuba's economic life has brought out criticism [of the circumstance] that the Cubans have invested the money that might go into industry, in apartment houses.

"Our Revolution has gone, is going, and will go against those parasitic and backward forms of wealth; but we do not oppose useful wealth; and in Cuba's present historic stage, all wealth that helps our economic development is useful.

"The Cuban industrialists have submitted to the government, through their Association, a study of [our] economic development. It is up to the Government to determine, through its technical instruments, the advantages and disadvantages of [inherent in] that plan. But the fact that the Association of Industrialists has made this type of recommendation, that it expresses its faith in our country, that it collaborates, from the viewpoint of [our] common interest, with the Revolution, merits the applause of all Cubans; and I, as a citizen, in opening this Forum, do not want to evade adding my own.

"The Land Reform is a starting point for the progress of the Cuban industry; and we are sure that there will be many wealthy Cubans, Cubans with useful wealth, who will see it [in this light].

"The Tariff Reform, which is being planned, contains a whole [new] system of protection for the national industries—big, medium, and small: and the fact that the Revolutionary Government has proposed these measures is a clear indication of the objectives of this Revolution that is being sponsored by us.

#### "PROTECTION FOR THE INDUSTRY IN THE TARIFF ACT

"The Tax [sic 'Tariff'] Reform is invested with distinct measures of protection for the private investors who strive to develop the economy. Those who accuse the Revolution of being too radical should meditate on those things; because when the revolutionary program and the position of the Revolutionary Government are viewed as a whole, there will be a better understanding of what it is that we want. We want, in peace as in war, the aggrandizement of Cuba. Our enemies are those only who oppose that aggrandizement. We are not stubborn sectarians, but patriots looking out for the future of our country. We are not turning a deaf ear to dialog. What we reject, definitively, is the monolog indulged in here at all times by the mighty; the imposition on us from the outside.<sup>4</sup>

"We are opening this Forum at a time when [some of our] sister countries in Latin America have started a noble fight for their liberties [liberation or independence].

"Cuba has already declared its solidarity with all those who, in any part of the world, are seeking to obtain for their peoples a life free from tyranny.

<sup>4</sup> Possibly, "intervention by foreign powers."—Translator.

"In the recent past, when we Cubans were engaged in the terrible battle for ridding ourselves of Batista, the feeling of friendship of other countries of the world had served us as an incentive. Especially, the encouragement which had come to us from our sister countries in Latin America had served as an admirable stimulus for us.

"José Martí, in speaking of the Antilles [Caribbean countries] 50 years ago, said that, 'They must save themselves together, or they are going to perish together.' Today, in view of the present world conditions, the countries of Latin America must also save themselves together [in togetherness], must unite, for the sake of their salvation [survival].

"The Revolutionary Government said, through the lips of its Prime Minister and its Chancellor, that Cuba will not interfere in the affairs of any neighbor country. I also had occasion to give expression to this policy when, in the absence of our Commander Fidél Castro, I explained the movement of the Armed Forces in connection with the Panamanian problem.

"But Cuba cannot be indifferent to the fate of our brothers [sister countries].

"If, right next to us, prisoners of war are killed, unarmed villages are machine-gunned, the woeful crime of genocide is committed, Cuba cannot look impassively upon that horror. 'To look at a crime with calmness is to commit it,' the Apostle [Martí] said.

"That is why, as explained in the official Note, Cuba has severed its relations with the Dominican Republic.

"But Cuba is working in peace and for peace.

"This Forum is a good example thereof. The Chief of the Rebel Armed Forces, in response to an invitation which he accepted as an honor, is here debating on the Land Reform, engaged in a constructive task.

"The military leaders are now collaborating toward improving the economy, and the rural workers—identified with the Revolution—have taken charge of watching our sky and our coasts. The country is a strong beachhead against any internal or external enemy. That is why we can work with serenity.

"In one of their last meetings at Camaguey the farmers had chosen as their slogan: 'LAND REFORM OR DEATH.'"

Mr. BRADEN. Going ahead with this [reading from his own speech of April 9, 1959]:

The overriding danger lies in the fact that so many of his words and actions strictly follow the Communist line.

Mr. SOURWINE. Speaking of Castro, Fidel Castro?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Also he has been allegedly surrounded by Communists or fellow travelers, among whom have been mentioned his brother Raul and the Argentine "Che" Guevara, who was active under Arbenz in Guatemala.

There are many others that surround them. For instance, Mr. Matthews in his article yesterday said there is no one in the Cabinet that is a Communist, Raul Roa, who has been the representative in the Organization of American States, now has gone back and taken over from Agremonte as Foreign Minister—Minister of State as they call it there. When I was Ambassador in Cuba, I knew of him as a rabid Communist, in his early days rather of a Trotskyite variety but certainly after Stalin's death he switched to be fully in line with Moscow—there is a lot of information confirming this.

Then you have his brother as the head of the Army. His brother's wife was trained in sabotage behind the Iron Curtain.

You have Hart, Minister of Education, who is known to be——

Mr. SOURWINE. Armando Hart.

Mr. BRADEN. Armando Hart, an extreme radical if not Communist and I think he is probably a Communist. Certainly his wife is.

This fellow, David Salvador, who is the head of the labor organization, now says that he is not a Communist, but when I was Ambassador in Cuba he was on our list of leading Communists there.



And so on down the line. Perhaps the most interesting two cases are the two men that are the director and deputy director of the new agrarian reform law. One of them was a Communist or quasi-Communist professor who had written such a terribly Communist book that it had to be burned under the previous regime.

I can give you his name in just a second.

Senator JOHNSTON. While you are looking for that, I would like to say just for the record too that what you are testifying to at the present time just substantiates other evidence that we have received along his same line about these same men.

Mr. BRADEN. The head of the agrarian setup is a man Nunez Jimenez, who very definitely was a Communist. I have got somewhere—maybe I can look that up and I will get you the other man's name.

Mr. SOURWINE. His deputy you say?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes, his deputy. He has used two names. And from 1943 during the last 2 years of my stay as Ambassador in Cuba, he was the editor of the agricultural column in the Communist newspaper Hoy.

Mr. SOURWINE. Let the record show you are speaking—and you will furnish that name later?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Going back to my statement, the foregoing statement I hope will elicit questions not only to me but to such distinguished Cuban patriots as Emilio Nunez Portuondo, former Cuban Ambassador in the United Nations, and the most staunch defender of the United States and anti-Communist ever to appear in the meetings of that body; former Prime Minister Jorge Garcia Montes; former Finance Minister Garcia Reyneri; the former Chief of Cuban Intelligence, Col. Mariano Faget; Dr. Mario Saladrigas, a Cuban businessman of highest integrity.

I would like to say here, I don't know of anyone in Cuba who knows more about communism than Faget does. He is one of the finest intelligence officers that I have ever run across and I am sure that the FBI will certainly confirm this to you, and I have no doubt that the CIA also will.

During the war he did a most outstanding job. He ran down a most dangerous spy. We got word from up here, about a German radio operating there and letters going out to a drop box in Argentina, and that is all we had; yet Mariano Faget, with such scant information, was able to locate the man. He was captured and finally shot.

Incidentally that is perhaps an interesting story. I hope I don't wander too far afield as collateral thoughts occur to me.

Batista has been accused of being terribly bloodthirsty. There is no question but what the people under him during the last couple of years have been bloodthirsty.

They were murderers, torturers, and it was extremely bad.

Nevertheless, I would say that in general it was a case of the pot calling the kettle black, because simultaneously the Fidelistas and Communists were leaving bombs in the Woolworth's store or El Encanto, which is the Sach's Fifth Avenue of Havana more or less. They were bombing cabarets and restaurants everywhere.

Fidel Castro has given his movement the name "26th of July" because that was the date when he raided the Moncada Barracks near Santiago. They came up from back behind the guards, which I suppose is all right in that kind of thing, but having gotten into the barracks they went into the hospital section and murdered soldiers sick in bed in cold blood, stabbed them to death. They were captured and Fidel and his brother were condemned to 15 years imprisonment. After about 18 months Batista let them out, which is not so terribly bloodthirsty considering all that they had done.

But there was cruelty on both sides. Going back to Batista, when we captured this German spy, and he was tried. The Cuban Constitution, under which Castro says he is now operating, prohibits the death penalty excepting in the event of war.

Then under martial law a man may be sentenced to death. Batista refused to make the decision whether this spy, Nazi spy, should be condemned to life imprisonment under civilian law or whether to go to the death penalty under martial law, and sent his Prime Minister over to see me as the American Ambassador, and I had to make the decision that he should be shot. Batista was not willing to do it.

Another event: In 1942 when Batista was an invited guest of the President to visit Washington, I came along on the trip. While we were away, some comedians in a local review ridiculed Batista and his wife. Some of Batista's henchmen took these comedians out, beat them up and gave them the famous castor oil treatment. When Batista got back to Cuba, he was enraged and had his own people arrested and severely punished. Now that is not the act of a bloodthirsty dictator.

I think it is worthwhile to bring that point out because it is usually forgotten. Everybody says he was such a terrible person. But the killings now I believe are much closer to 3,500 to 4,000 than the admitted total of 600. What is more they are a typically Communist procedure.

Latin American revolutions sometimes in the past could be bloodthirsty while they were fighting. They could do some pretty bad things. But once the fighting was over, they never went in for this shooting and all the cruelty now going on in Cuba. They would let the defeated people get out of the country. They would live abroad for years. Of course in due time they would come back and stage their own revolution and that is how it would go.

But this shooting business is definitely Communist.

Senator JOHNSTON. The treatment of Fidel Castro is a good illustration of that.

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Senator JOHNSTON. And his brother too.

Mr. BRADEN. Exactly.

Anything that has happened in respect of Communist penetration in the Far East or Near East or elsewhere in the world from the point of view of the United States sinks into insignificance alongside this threat from the Caribbean. Unless summary action is taken promptly I dread to think of what may happen to these United States.

Unless we take immediate and strong measures, Khrushchev may, as he has announced, bury us.

The very life of the United States is at stake.

I can't overemphasize how seriously I regard this matter.



I would like to have as part of your record also this translation from "Antecedents and Secrets of April 9," by Alberto Nino, ex-chief of security in Bogota, Colombia. This is a book he wrote after he was chief of police; have you got that in your record so far?

Mr. SOURWINE. We would be very happy to have that translation.

Mr. BRADEN. This is a translation of a chapter headed "Communism and the Ninth Conference" in which he details how Fidel Castro arrived in Bogota just at the time of the Inter-American Conference—when General Marshall was presiding over the U.S. delegation. You will remember the Communist-incited and led mobs practically destroyed the city at that time. This chief of police tells how Castro and two other young Cubans participated in those riots actively. Also, I can add to that a confirmation given me by Guillermo Belt, who was formerly the Cuban Ambassador here, who was the head of the Cuban delegation at that conference when all of the destruction and killing was going on. Some of the Latin American delegations said, "We will pull out, go home." And they called for their airplanes to come and get them. General Marshall said, "Nothing doing. We are not going to let the Communists destroy this conference." He won out and got them to stay. When the two airplanes sent for the Cuban delegation and their luggage were about to fly back to Havana, back to Cuba, Guillermo Belt was approached by these three young Cubans—including Fidel. The Colombian police already had arrested them two or three times because they were active in the Communist insurrection. Whether true or not, Castro is said to have boasted he killed one or two or three priests. In any case Belt himself has told me that he put them on the baggage plane and got them back to Cuba, he having no idea then what they had done.

(The excerpt requested by Mr. Braden, as translated from the Spanish by the Library of Congress, reads as follows:)

(Source: Alberto Nino H. (former chief of security. "Antecedentes y Secretos del 9 de Abril." Bogota, Colombia [1950?], pp. 26-28.)

#### COMMUNISM AND THE NINTH CONFERENCE

National Communism, "sailing under foreign flags," was keenly interested in making the Pan American Conference of Bogotá a failure. This was Polichinela's secret. To that effect, a meeting was called in the loft of the Mazuera warehouse for the purpose of arriving at an understanding with Gaitán and organizing the sabotage of the Conference. The meeting was a failure because some of the leaders did not attend; but a commission was appointed by the chiefs to talk with Gaitán and explain the Communist plans to him. They thought it would be easy to exploit the illustrious politician's natural resentment of not having been included in the delegation to the Conference, but he did not want to listen to them and, when he found out about the sabotage plans, he reported them and quite openly ordered the Liberalists to refrain from participating in them and actually to oppose their realization.

#### SERIOUS THREAT

It was said [rumored]—it could neither be verified nor proved—that Augusto Durán then voiced a serious threat. The truth is that the press gave out the information and that, in spite of its enormous seriousness, it has not been corrected [confirmed either way] to this day. There would be nothing strange about this version: Durán is a sullen man, without conscience or morality. He has something of a Lombroso in him, and a lot about him is pathological. Cold and asocial like a pirate, he is capable of ordering at his "aulics" the committing of any kind of crime, without any display of emotion, because he is as cruel, rude, and cowardly as a Chinese bandit. On the Ninth of April he was hiding

out, but from his hiding place he issued mimeographed orders for the assassination of General Sánchez Amaya, Col. Barco, and others. He is also a traitor to his ideas because of his personal dislike of Vieira; and capitalism, if he did not despise it as he does, could find in him a spy and helpmate as efficacious as the amount of the remuneration offered to him.

When Gaitán made his statement, I asked the Ministry of Justice to have a judge appointed to investigate that vibrant and authoritative denunciation, together with my own reports and data on the capture of arms and possible attacks against the public order, since as Chief of Security I did not have the legal resources for proceeding to a thorough investigation, but they did not listen to me. Nevertheless, I don't believe that National Communism participated directly and consciously in the assassination of Gaitán, inasmuch as its lack of unity prevented it from acting in absolute secrecy. However, a few days before the date of the Conference, a Communist meeting was held at the Odeon Theatre, at which Vieira spoke of the possibility that the Conference might agree to outlawing Communism, and at which he emphasized the need, in that event, for covering the Communist activities with a cloak of secrecy. He attacked Dr. Gaitán, but mentioned that it was indispensable for the Communists to infiltrate the Gaitán movement in order to "copy" it. He warned that from now on the Communist Cells should not hold their meetings in the same place [twice], but in different parts [localities], in order to elude the vigilance of the police.

#### COMMUNIST DIVISION

The Communists, aggressively divided into two groups, were constantly meeting in different places in the city, in a kind of proselytist emulation of violence. Vieira, a highly intellectual, cordial and well-mannered man, an energetic, though sometimes apathetic, leader, headed one of the groups, the largest; Durán, asocial, an ignoramus and following a semi-eclectic method, headed the other. Vieira advocated opposition "without truce" and immediate violent revolution; Durán advised infiltration into all government organizations and peaceful propaganda inasmuch as, in his opinion, the Colombian labor movement had not yet attained the necessary revolutionary maturity for attempting to seize the power by violence [force]; the former recommended penetration [infiltration] into "Gaitanism," the latter, outright and open fight against Gaitán, whom he considered a dangerous counterrevolutionist, since by his thesis and activities he had revived the hopes of the people in the bourgeois and liberal systems.

In this tug of war, the material [physical] clashes between the two groups have been frequent. Durán, weaker, sought out the support and backing of the authorities, and even of certain organizations to be qualified as reactionary. But in the campaigns waged by him he was more violent and radical than Vieira. Both exercised—and still do—notable and almost decisive influence over the syndical [trade union] organizations. The CTC has always been serving Communism and the Mexican CTAL which is controlled by Russia by way of Lombardo Toledano.

Anyone within that group attempting to disengage himself from that exotic [foreign] influence, either to better serve the workers or to defend Liberalism, is expelled and liquidated, as had happened to Guillermo Rodríguez, Hernando Restrepo Botero, Bernardo Medina, Juan C. Lara, Rafael Castillo, and others. International or Russian Communism does not take our bifrontal, ingenuous Communism seriously, and although it uses and directs it, without offering explanations, it is being looked down upon [by the Russians] without [their] making an attempt to conceal this fact. Antonio García and Gerardo Molina were much closer to the Russian Embassy and the Moscow agents than were Vieira or Durán. Salvador Ocampo, Machado, Luis Fernández Juan, Eugene Kerbaul, Milorad Pecic B., Francis McKinnon Damon, Blas Roca, Fidél Alejandro Castro, Rafael Lázaro del Pino, and other foreign Communists, who had much to do with the preparations for the Ninth of April, did not, during their visits to Colombia, bother with Vieira or Durán, but had talks with Gerardo Molina, Antonio García, Luis Carlos Pérez, Montaña Cuéllar, the almost unknown Jaime Rubio, and the CTC as [representative of] the Labor leadership.

MR. BRADEN. I think it is also interesting to have this translation of an article which appeared, and I have the original article here, but I think probably the translation would appeal to you more, of an

article which appeared in *La República* on January 21, 1959, in Bogotá, Colombia, in which they give the whole history of Castro during that so-called time of the "blood bath," and which has never been denied. They have had the representatives—

Senator JOHNSTON. That will become a part of the record.

(The article referred to, as translated from the Spanish by the Library of Congress, reads as follows:)

#### FIDEL CASTRO PARTICIPATED IN THE EVENTS OF APRIL 9 [1948]

##### DISTRIBUTED LEAFLETS WHEN OSPINA WAS PRESIDENT

(By Mario Acosta Hurtado)

When all America and the whole western world were shocked by the "blood bath," patronized [sic] and ordered by Rebel Leader Fidél Castro, historic and transcendental documentary evidence surrounding the activities of the young Rebel leader in Colombia on the days preceding the 9th of April, was being brought to light.

According to the investigations made by secret agents into that period, Fidél Castro was one of the most dangerous agitators who had, in the company of other comrades, engaged in clandestine activities which finally culminated in horrible bloodshed, looting, malicious burning of property, and chaos.

##### BACKGROUND HISTORY

Late in the evening of April 3, 1948, a public ceremony took place at the "Teatro Colón" of Bogotá, which was attended by the most prominent members of society and Government, and present at which were, among others, the then President of the Republic, Dr. Mariano Ospina Pérez, and his wife, and Dr. Laureano Gómez and Mrs. Gómez. During one of the intermissions of the play that was being presented, some leaflets, which had been printed in Havana, Cuba, with a definite Communist flavor and attacking the colonialism exercised by the United States and Great Britain, were thrown from the upper part of the theatre—the gallery—into the orchestra pit.

A secret agent who was present [stationed] inside the theatre climbed to the gallery and verified the fact that the leaflets had been thrown by two foreigners who had in their possession a goodly quantity of those flyers which they were continuing to distribute, in view hereof the detective apprehended them. They were subsequently identified through their respective passports which had been issued in the names of Fidél Castro and Rafael del Pino.

Castro and Del Pino were led out of the theatre by two secret agents who took them to the place where they said they were staying, i.e., Room 33 of the Claridge Hotel, at the corner of Calle 16 and Carrera 5 of this city. Questioned by the detectives on the purpose of their coming to Colombia, they stated that they had been sent by the "Comité de la Unión Estudiantil Americana," whose headquarters are located in Havana.

They also stated that they had entered Colombia at Medellín airport six days previously (March 29), and that the main purpose of their stay in Colombia was to arrange a series of talks among the students in Bogotá, in the interest of closer cooperation among the students of Latin America, and in support of the anti-colonialism policy which several of the countries attending the Bogotá Conference were going to propose. They showed the detectives a letter of recommendation written by Rómulo Betancourt on behalf of Castro and Del Pino, as well as some Cuban and Venezuelan newspapers in which their pictures appeared as members of the student committee above referred to.

In these circumstances, the detectives decided to take them immediately to the offices of the National Security Agency. They did so, having previously seized their passports and copies of the leaflets. The Security desk officer at that particular time, Mr. Pablo Serrano, decided that it was not proper to keep them in custody and ordered their immediate release as well as the return to them of the passports and other papers which had been seized. However, one of the detectives notified them that they would have to appear the following Monday in the office of the Chief of the Bureau for Aliens of the National Security Agency



in order to make appropriate arrangements in regard to their papers and their stay in Colombia inasmuch as those that they were carrying were good only for a stay of 24 hours and had already expired.

As they did not appear the following Monday—April 5—the detective made a full report to the Chief of the Bureau for Aliens (at that time, Dr. Camilo Cortés Zapata) who decided to go with the detective to the residence of the Cubans, which occurred at 2:30 p.m. of April 6. Dr. Cortés again seized the passports and, together with the detective, searched the premises confiscating more leaflets (the remainder of those described in the theatre), photos of Dr. Jorge Eliécer Gaitán, leaflets [written] by him, foreign newspapers with pictures of Castro and Del Pino, a book autographed by Rómulo Betancourt, and a cablegram reading: “Havana, Cuba, April 3, 1948. Fal-Pino. Bogotá. Hotel Claridge. Sure, this tenth [or, “that city, 10 (o’clock)”?] on the dot. Iglesias.”

On April 7 the Cubans presented themselves at the Bureau for Aliens, where they were interrogated by the Chief of the Bureau concerning the business which had brought them to Colombia, and their explanations were similar to those which they had previously given to the detectives.

Their identities were checked out and placed on record (these personal descriptions and records disappeared on April 9 because the building in which the Security Authority was housed had been set on fire and all the files had been burned).

The Chief of the Bureau for Aliens informed them of their obligations as aliens with regard to the laws of Colombia and authorized them, [through visas] on their passports, to stay in the country as tourists.

There is no report on the activities of the Cubans on April 9, 10, 11, and 12, as the Security Agency had been “practically dissolved owing to the events of April 9.”

On the 13th, a group of detectives received orders to apprehend them and, in compliance with this order, they went to the Claridge Hotel where they were informed by the manager that on the morning of that day, after paying their bill, they had taken out their bags and gone to the Cuban Legion [sic—“Legation”?] in Bogotá. During the night of the 9th they had arrived at the hotel armed with revolvers and rifles, the hotel manager added, and with the proceeds of the looting, and they had talked in English over the phone with several persons, among others with an Iglesias Mojica, an individual who had registered at the Granada Hotel of Bogotá several days before and with whom the Cubans had maintained close relations. After the 9th of April, Castro and Del Pino obviously became worried, to the extent that they had asked the hotel manager to keep them hidden [or, “their presence secret”].

Citizen Guillermo Hoenigsberg, a guest at the hotel for several days, informed the detectives on the 13th that he had heard several conversations of the Cubans, in which they had been bragging about the success of the *coup* and their participation in it. He also stated that in his opinion, if the Cubans were not the brains behind, they were at least accomplices in, the events that had occurred in Bogotá, as Communist agents. In support of his statements, Hoenigsberg handed the detectives a passbook with the photos of the Cubans, which passbook identified them as Grade One agents [agents of No. 1 rank?] in the Third Front of the USSR in South America.

Detective No. 106 also said that the Cubans were not “students,” inasmuch as in some papers that had been seized from them, their profession in Cuba appeared to be [in] “Arts and Crafts.”

The newspaper *El Siglo* in July 1948, reported the news relative to the Cubans in its Friday, July 2, 1948, number, page 1, in the following manner and under the headline: “Rómulo Betancourt headed plot against the Nacional [sic—Nation?] on April ninth. Was prepared in the City of Havana. Tells how on the even of April 9 a group of delegates of the “Federación Mundial de Juventudes” [World Youth Federation] (Communist organization) visited Colombia on the occasion of the Pan-American Conference meeting in Bogotá, who had problems with the detectives stationed at the Techo airport, as some of them did not have regular [proper] identification papers.”

Mr. SOURWINE. That is both of those translations.

Senator JOHNSTON. Both.



(The second document referred to above reads as follows:)

[El Tiempo, Caracas, Venezuela, January 21, 1959, p. 5]

### WHAT IS IT THAT A REVOLUTION IS MADE FOR?

To make [set off] a revolution has always been easier than to organize a victory. For the former, luck, courage, and faith are needed; for the latter, the same, plus other, though less common, virtues such as austerity, sense of balance, justice, self-discipline and control over the natural excesses of the multitudes. That is what the victor of Cuba, Dr. Castro, bore in mind when he referred, as he spoke to the people for the first time after the overthrow of the dictator, to the beginnings of the most difficult stage of the "26th of July Movement." And in those days the evidence proved how right the valiant rebel leader was, whose laurels have unfortunately become stained with blood, defamed, in all probability, by that elemental justice of vengeance, but, also, by that undoubted loss of moral prestige for the Movement which had stirred up so much sympathy in the world.

Because the age-old talion law responds to the most primitive forms of human culture, when it is applied to a civilized society, it necessarily leads to a form of barbarism which is no less so by the claim of its justification because of the—undeniable—sins of the victims. The savagery of the dictatorships cannot be fought with other [another form of] savagery exercised by the democrats; precisely as Christianity would not be a force of civilization today if it had responded to Nero with the crucifixion of the Roman legionnaires. Sometimes martyrs are necessary so that a noble cause may [be used to] cover up stupidity or wickedness; and generosity, a virtue so difficult to find in those in power, is not only a moral value but also another form of politics.

It would be impossible, in effect, to morally renew the Cuban country if, prompted by the incredible excesses of Batista's political police, these same excesses are committed by the revolutionary police. If revolutions are not made for the purpose of changing methods, doctrines, and systems of government, they cease to be revolutions and simply become substitutions for the tyrannies which have been overthrown. It may be argued, naturally, that the criminals executed at the time by virtue of summary trials had deserved their fate many times over, and that the death of an innocent man cannot be made up for by the execution of his tormentor. But that is not the point. The important factor is the validity of certain principles and procedures, virtually joined together with political culture and democratic morality; the right, for example, to be tried under the due process of law, to have the assistance of counsel for his defense, and to be presumed innocent until proven guilty. And it is not easy to observe those guarantees under the uncontrolled pressure of the public, of trials without counsel for the defense, and of sentences pronounced in the heat of most primitive reactions.

The provisional President, Dr. Urrutia, who is a lawyer by profession, rose high among his fellow citizens precisely because of his courage to apply the principles of law under the rule of dictatorship. Those principles are precisely the ones which must be upheld after the dictator has been overthrown, because that is precisely what revolutions are made for. One should not lose sight of the fact that the dictatorship of the masses may be as blind and arbitrary as the worst of despotisms.

MR. BRADEN. I mentioned the U.S. Council of the Inter-American Council to you before. I was asked by the Chairman of the Council not to include the memorandum that is attached to the Council's letter in any published testimony. I can leave it with you, but with the request that it not be published.

SENATOR JOHNSTON. Make a special note and detail on that.

MR. SOURWINE. What the Ambassador has said is now a part of this record. If this goes into the executive record it would be something to be deleted in the event the record is made public.

MR. BRADEN. However, I may say that the letter—I helped in drafting it—I think is of interest.

It reads as follows and it is addressed to the Honorable Christian Herter, copies having been sent to Mr. Waugh of the Export-Im-

port Bank, to the Secretary of Defense and I have forgotten who else, probably Commerce. It is addressed to Mr. Herter:

I enclose a statement of the views unanimously approved at a membership meeting of the U.S. Inter-American Council on June 12, 1959, in Chicago.

On behalf of the Council, I have been asked to transmit the statement to you to call your attention respectfully to the fact that the new Cuban "agrarian reform" law completely ignores not only recognized international law and usages but also the 1940 Cuban Constitution which has been accepted by the present regime in that country. That constitution and the constitutions of most Latin American nations provide that expropriation of private property can only be made for a dominating public purpose and upon payment of prior and just compensation in cash.

Unfortunately, these constitutional provisions have been violated not only in Cuba, but also in Brazil and Bolivia where private property of American citizens has been expropriated without prior and just compensation. The unsatisfactory Cuban situation is further aggravated by the fact that the constitutional right of appeal to the courts no longer is available since the courts are not operating freely in that country.

It is the view of the USIAC that, unless the U.S. Government forthwith takes effective measures to protect the rights of its citizens, many of them, and the corporations in which they have invested their savings will suffer irreparable loss and damage under the Cuban "agrarian reform" law, and other countries will be tempted to follow this outrageous Cuban precedent.

Efficacious action now may save our Government from serious embarrassment and prevent its being forced to take more disagreeable measures subsequently.

A strong stand by the United States in defense of its citizens and their rights also would enhance substantially and favorably our prestige and standing throughout Latin America and elsewhere.

A secondary, but important, result might flow from such a public statement: citizens in all walks of life in every Latin American country seek to own and put their savings into land and real estate as a prime investment. The Cuban agrarian reform law therefore has attacked the very foundations of the individual wealth of all the Latin American people of every class. Even an indirect defense of their property rights by the U.S. Government on principle, in the opinion of the Council, would not be an intervention, but would have a strong appeal in winning the respect and friendship of these peoples.

With expressions of high esteem, I am,

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM F. COMES,  
*Executive Director.*

Mr. SOURWINE. May the letter go in with the understanding that the memorandum is also inserted but only for the executive record?

Senator JOHNSTON. That shall be done.

Mr. BRADEN. I have here the transcript of my extemporaneous remarks at the June 12, 1959, meeting of the U.S. Inter-American Council, Inc.

Senator JOHNSTON. It will be included in the record.

EXTEMPORANEOUS REMARKS BY HON. SPRUILLE BRADEN BEFORE JUNE 12, 1959,  
MEETING OF U.S. INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC., CHICAGO, ILL.

What I propose to do, is to extemporize on my own experiences, as it were, reminisce a little bit. In this informal way, perhaps I can inform some of you about the things that have happened in the past in respect of communism. Things that only a very few of you can remember, whereas my accumulated years permit me to do so. In so doing, I should quote the old Spanish adage, "The devil knows more by reason of his age than by reason of being a devil."

I follow this procedure because as I've gone around in this country, in business, diplomacy, socially and every other wise, I find a shocking ignorance of what communism really is. I don't expect such lack of knowledge in this group. You're much better informed than the average; many of you have lived abroad and have had firsthand experience with the extreme left. But I do find elsewhere a most appalling ignorance and apathy.

There is terrific confusion about what dialectic materialism is. Anybody trying to read about it can't understand the Soviet and the Communist interpretation of "materialism." It means something quite different to them than it does to us. The same thing is true with "democracy," "peace," "liberty" and a number of other words. I think we also add to that confusion. For instance, we talk about private enterprise. Even in this country, thanks to our leftwingers and Socialists, private enterprise has taken on a connotation of bigness, of big corporations and even of evil. The fact that the corporations, in most cases, are owned by a great number of very small stockholders, is entirely forgotten. All of this helps to create and increase general confusion.

Many people don't know the difference between so-called international and national communism. Then, matters are complicated further when we get to Latin America, because there are a whole series of different gradations of Marxists in that area. You've got many leftwing groups. In Mexico, you have the Cardenistas; in Costa Rica, the followers of Pepe Figueres; in Venezuela, the Acción Democrática; in Peru, the Apristas; the MNR in Bolivia, and so on, all around the circle. I think these divergent leftist groups add tremendously to the confusion, because each differs from the other; although in the end, they are all Marxists, Socialists, or extreme radicals.

Ravines, the former Peruvian Communist, lumps all of them together, in his latest book, as Justicialistas. He does not employ the word as Peron and his followers interpreted it. Instead, he simply puts all of these various kinds of Marxists and leftists into one broad classification. They form a melange which is extremely dangerous for us, since they at best are Socialists. Thus, they believe in state controls, oppose private ownership and enterprise and go all out for every radical, insane, and unworkable nostrum anyone happens to invent.

In a talk the other day, I went into some more detail as to how the Communists try to get the nationalists to join with them, how they emphasize anti-Americanism—anti-United Statesism—as a most important point. And that goes not only for the Stalinists and other Moscow-directed Communists, but for all these other groups to whom I have referred.

In other words, the greatest danger does not come alone from the Communist parties, but also from all these other groups who in effect become their allies, even though they often seem to oppose communism at least superficially. It is impressive to see the way the Communists are able to inveigle these Socialists, nationalists, and other people into working with them. As a matter of fact, the commies frequently hide and camouflage the development of the real Communist Party by the Communists themselves joining other parties. I just had a case brought to my attention in Argentina: a mayor of a town in Mendoza, who was Communist, was registered as a member of the Radical Party; but he was foolish enough to admit brazenly that he was a Communist. He got fired as mayor, and he also was fired out of the Communist Party, because as still another mayor, who was equally Communist, put it, he was just a damn fool to disclose himself as really being a Communist [sic].

Their policy, at least to begin with, is not to acquire power directly for the Communists, nor to take office themselves, but to get into office these allies or stooges, people they know that they can handle whether it be a Castro or even some apparently respectable people who are not Communists. But these naive theorists and do-gooders often will follow that leftwing course which opens the way eventually for the Communists.

We are terribly credulous in this country. I think one of the great American virtues is that we are very prone to assign to others what we hope are our virtues of honesty and integrity, and of saying what we mean. We therefore believe and trust in others. We accept the statements by all these other groups, including Communists, in the same way as we expect our declarations to be accepted as truthful.

Also, we are afflicted with apathy. We recently have heard statements—I won't quote them now—but just within the last 3 weeks, there have been statements by Adlai Stevenson and Adolf Berle. Adlai Stevenson's was completely down the Communist line, yet nobody has called him on it; Berle followed the Socialist line; and even Mr. Dillon, as Under Secretary of State, has made a statement recently which is disturbing from the point of view of anybody familiar with business. He urged private investment abroad even when the atmosphere was unsatisfactory. This kind of statement helps to mislead our public, and worse still, other peoples. Most harmful of all our attitudes are



the bad examples that we give here in this country by ourselves accepting so much socialism and state interventionism.

I said I was going to reminisce a bit. I'm like everybody else and I assume, so are most of you on the subject of communism. Because of our background, education, and experience, we mostly always have had a great distaste for communism. We did not and do not like it. Nevertheless, we really didn't know too much about it.

I remember the IWW, when as a boy of 17, I was working in the mines in Nevada. They were pretty bad, but they didn't seem any worse than Hoffa or Reuther do today. God knows, that is bad enough. But the IWW was Anarcho-Communist, or what, somewhat later, we called Bolsheviks. Then, as now, they did not hesitate at any crime, including murder.

I remember in Chile, right after the First World War, the Chilean Government did something that apparently was cruel and inhuman. Actually, it was the only thing to do. Some Communists—Bolsheviks—began to activate strikes and insurrections in Chile, very actively trying to stir up trouble. The Chilean Government had about five to seven of their leaders arrested and incarcerated in San Antonio and the newspapers, even *El Mercurio* and *Diario Ilustrado* asked editorially, "Well, what are they holding these people down in San Antonio for?" (that is a port several miles south of Valparaiso) "what are they holding them there for?" Whereupon the Government replied, "The press is perfectly right. We'll send them up to Valparaiso."

So they put—I think there were seven of them, six or seven—they put these six or seven Bolsheviks in a rowboat, and tied the rowboat to a tug. This was in the wintertime, when the South Pacific can get pretty rough. When the tug got to Valparaiso, everyone was oh! so disappointed! The rowboat had upset and these Bolsheviks were missing. There was the quickest exodus from Chile you ever did see. Bolsheviks were practically scrambling over the Andes on their knees and hanging on with their nails going over Aconcagua to get out of Chile.

As I say, everybody protested at that time. But let me assure you that is the only, I repeat only, type of action or language that a Communist understands and we must remember that whenever we have to deal with them.

Later on in 1931, after Ibañez fell, the *Almirante La Torre*, the Chilean dreadnought, was anchored in the bay at Coquimbo, and the Bolsheviks were able to infiltrate and start a mutiny—an insurrection on board the *La Torre*. The Chilean Army airplanes had to bomb their own battleship to put an end to the rioting. I was interviewed at that time in a front-page article in the *New York Times*. I displayed my complete ignorance of the operations of communism by saying, "You can never have communism in Chile because the Chilean roto is too much of an individualist, he won't stand for it." I was totally ignorant because I didn't realize the way the Communists—and it only takes a small number of them—get control is by terror, murder and every other kind of evil measures. They get control of a situation by killing the individualists and patriots by hundreds, thousands or millions, as they may deem necessary. In this manner a mere handful of Communists have taken over millions upon millions of people in Russia, China, and elsewhere.

I don't think that anybody in Washington, certainly not in the country as a whole, appreciated in 1932, when there was a Communist uprising in El Salvador, what was really happening there. Yet there were 20,000 people killed. Now the interesting thing in these instances is that even then, Moscow through the Communist groups and parties, was probing, trying out, to see where it could get its foot in the door to the Western Hemisphere.

In 1933, I went to the Seventh International Conference of American States as a delegate with Cordell Hull. There were demonstrations against our delegation by the Communists—placards and everything else—all over Montevideo. As a matter of fact, while this was reported in the papers, it was exaggerated a bit because the official banquet by the President was delayed for 2 or 3 hours; we didn't sit down at the table until 11:30 p.m. The newspapers published that it was due to some vague Communist plot. Actually it wasn't, it was just the chief of protocol went to sleep, and didn't wake up in time. Nevertheless, there were the Communists again, always "Johnny-on-the-spot" to make trouble.

Then when I went on to the Chaco Peace Conference, settling the war between Bolivia and Paraguay. I still was innocent (both in the Latin and Anglo-Saxon sense of the word). Accusations were made against Bolivia, that she was supported by the Standard Oil of New Jersey, and that Paraguay was supported



by the Shell Oil Co., and that this was really a war between Standard Oil and Shell. Of course, that was pure balderdash; as a matter of fact, the Standard Oil suffered very severely at the hands of the Bolivian Government during and after that war. But the Communists used this false propaganda with telling effect.

The first time that I really began to recognize what was happening, and the unvarying and inevitable double-faced nature of the Communists, was when I was Ambassador in Colombia. Colombia was being flooded with Nazi propaganda, most of it published in Buenos Aires, but some elsewhere in this hemisphere; it was brought in and distributed in Colombia by the Communists, not by the Nazis—despite the fact that the Nazis had a big strong organization there—but this anti-American Nazi propaganda was given out by the Communists.

In the meantime, I had established in the Embassy an intelligence service of a kind. We had no money for it whatsoever, but organized it, thanks to a German priest and to two U.S. oil companies—the Texas Co. and the Richmond Oil Co. (Standard Oil of California) who put up the money to employ and pay the men that we were using for our intelligence service. The minute that Germany attacked Russia, I called our quasi-intelligence agents in and said, "Get in touch with the Communists immediately and we'll get the full list of who, among the Nazis, are the most dangerous enemies we have here in Colombia." We never got one iota of information from the Communists—they wouldn't give it to us. I commented on that subsequently to Edgar Hoover, when I got back to Washington. He laughed and observed, "That's identically my experience here in the United States."

From Colombia I went on to Cuba in 1942—early 1942. At that time, Batista was the first president in the hemisphere who had a Communist Cabinet officer, Marinello. The Communists were in complete control of the labor federation through Lazaro Peña and Blas Roca. The situation was so bad in respect of growing Communist influence, that I sent in a number of dispatches and telegrams, and went to Washington myself on three different occasions, taking additional memoranda with me. In all these communications, I emphatically expressed my alarm as to the Communist infiltration in Cuba—and for that matter the rest of the hemisphere—at that time. The Communists were working through what they call the Frente Nacional Anti-Fascisti (National Anti-Fascist Front). And there again, I was taught a valuable lesson.

With what I had learned in Colombia, plus my natural antipathy to them, I was shocked when I arrived in Cuba to find that each year, on the Soviet national holiday, they had induced Batista to give a terrific show on the capitol steps in Havana, inviting all of the Cabinet officers, every official of any importance, all of the diplomatic corps—of course, by this time the Italians, the Germans, and Japanese were out—and then they would start the speechifying.

I just couldn't bring myself to go the first year I was there, so I arranged to be down the island, on a trip to Cienfuegos, much to the irritation of the Communists. I might say that I knew what would happen at these ceremonies, because I'd been to some other relatively minor shows where there would be some applause for Churchill and the British; a little more for Roosevelt and the United States; about the same for Chiang Kai-Shek and the Chinese; and then, when Stalin or the Soviet or Russian Army were mentioned, they had their clagues—they had perfect organizations, and the crowds, led by the commies, would just go wild, terrific applause, cheering and demonstrations.

The second year rolled around, I realized I had to go to this ceremony; so I prepared a speech, in which I said, "It's lamentable that there seems to be some rivalry between the Allied Powers as to who is contributing most to the war effort." (Of course, the Communists always whooped it up for the Red Army, how the Red Army was doing everything, with the implication that we and the British were cowards because we didn't go right into the second front.) I went on to say that "in the First World War, we had the same rivalry, everyone claiming full credit for the final victory: the Russians because of what they had done in the lake districts; the French, for the resistance at Verdun; the British because of their navy; and we, because we came in to give the coup de grace. So each one claimed the victory for themselves." I concluded, "Let's not have that again; there is glory enough for all."

Needless to say, my Soviet colleagues didn't like my remarks very much.

The third year, I had decided, come hell or high water, I was going to break up this National Anti-Fascist Front and this annual show—and here was when

I learned a valuable lesson. Gromyko had been sent to Cuba as Minister, the coldest eye I've ever seen in a human being, excepting for his second man, the chargé d'affaires I had to deal with. I was invited to speak again on the capitol steps. I called in all my other colleagues (by this time, I was dean of the corps)—the British, French, Brazilian, Chilean and so on down the line. I laid my program before them, which they approved. After they authorized me to speak for them, I called in the Russian chargé d'affaires and said, "Look (this was only 10 days before the meeting), neither I nor any of my colleagues are going to your big show."

Well, he threw a fit; he couldn't believe his ears at first. Then he began to pound my desk and shout at me in the most insulting fashion. He demanded that I go, and that all the other diplomats go or dire things would happen to us.

I said, "No, we're not going." After he'd repeated his violent act of high rage several times—he was not red, but purple in the face—I calmly commented: "You haven't asked me why we not going."

Very much startled, he said, "What is it?"

I said, "We're not going," and I pulled out the drawer of my desk, "because here is the documentary evidence that your National Anti-Fascist Front has been blackmailing Cubans, Americans, all kinds of people in Cuba; exacting money from them, threatening otherwise that they would see to it that they were put on the blacklist." I said, "That's sheer blackmail; we won't have anything to do with such an organization."

He completely turned around, he groveled, he practically got down on his knees, begging me to go. He said, "I'll go to anything that is given for the United States, the U.S. Army."

I said, "Don't you do that, don't you go to anything having to do with the United States, unless I personally ask you."

Then and there I learned, you should not try to bluff the Soviets; but if you have the goods and are tough, they'll back down. That, as I say, is the only language that they understand.

I went on, in due course, to Argentina, where I soon found that Peron was playing hand in glove with the Communists; as a matter of fact, on the third floor of the Casa Rosada, he had a number of Communists working every day. It was the Communists who directed and carried out the demonstrations against me, the distribution of leaflets, the attacks and vilifications against me, because for instance, of a tragic fire in the Braden Copper Co. mine in Chile. Fortunately when I got into the diplomatic service, realizing that there might be complications, I had sold all of my mining stocks—a considerable loss to me, I may say—but it was the only thing to do.

But Peron and the Communists attacked me in great big placards, in pamphlets and in newspapers, saying that I was a criminal, who had murdered more than 400 men in the mine fire. They had these placards, as big as those panels over there on the wall, dripping with red ink, as blood; there were countless photographs of the dead, the weeping widows, children, and mothers. Appalling pictures, and they covered Argentina with that defamatory stuff.

Fortunately, we had obtained copies of the telegrams the Peron government had sent to Chile in order to get these photographs. But the organization of that whole attack on me, and therefore, on the United States, was conceived and carried out by the Communists. Peron, in this and otherwise, worked hand in glove with them.

As a result of an incident at that time, I received a shock subsequently. It's in my April 6, 1954, testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Because I became so convinced of Peron's playing with the Communists just before the Potsdam Conference, I sent two top-secret cables—I can mention them now, because, as I say, it had to be brought out in my testimony—"For the President and the Secretary of State," in which I referred to all my many dispatches, telegrams, etc. from Havana and Buenos Aires, in which I had reported how the Soviet was directing Communist infiltration throughout the hemisphere, and particularly was agitating attacks against the United States. In July 1945, in these cables, I urged in the strongest terms that President Truman and Churchill put it up to Stalin and say, "This is what's happening in the Western Hemisphere. It's got to stop, or else."

I was always surprised that I never received any reply or comment on these two very important cables—and under State Department regulations, such cables, especially that of an Ambassador, are supposed to go directly to the President and the Secretary, and nobody else. The interesting thing is that later, I found that

the President and Secretary of State never received those telegrams, which is a pretty good indication of what I've said: "There may be a few Communists in the State Department—I think they're relatively few. It's the misguided idealists, the do-gooders, and what I've coined the expression to call them, Unidentifiable Theys." Among those groups are the guilty ones, who could and did block delivery of top-secret cables from an Ambassador to the President and Secretary of State.

Subsequently, I had further confirmations of this kind of treason, in connection with mail sent out by me to the Embassy in Buenos Aires for delivery by hand to, for instance, Ambassador Levillier. Peron was able to publish photostatic copies of the mail I had received and of the mail I had sent out, with every precaution taken. Peron was not clever enough to do it himself; it was his playing with the Communists that enabled him to get possession of those documents. The only place they, in turn, logically could have obtained them was in the Department.

I have referred to Batista as having the first Communist Cabinet Minister, and playing with the Communists himself, just as Peron was. I think we've got to make some allowances in his case; we were the first ones to recognize the Soviet in that period—the Argentines and Uruguayans had recognized them before and then broken relations. We not only had established diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R., but when we got to the San Francisco Organization of the United Nations Conference, the Russians' Mr. Molotov said that they would not follow the wishes of the 21 American Republics, about bringing Argentina into the United Nations, unless we got those Republics to recognize the Soviet Union. Therefore, to that end, we sent one of the higher officers of the State Department around South America telling these Republics, "You have got to recognize and establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet." Hence, I don't know that we can blame them too much for not appreciating fully the Communist-Soviet threat.

When I became Assistant Secretary of State, I was impressed by the meetings that we had there—15, 20, 25 people—and since the word "Soviet," I believe, means "meeting," I began to refer to our State Department meetings as "young Soviets." A lot of those attending were leftwing, and tried to oppose any sound measures that I wanted to take. For instance, after the "intervention" of the U.S.-owned tramway lines in Cuba, I telephoned to Harry Norweb, my successor as Ambassador in Cuba. I said, "Please get out of the files copy of a note that I wrote the Cuban authorities when I was Ambassador there in connection with the 'intervention' of the Tinguaro sugar mill, of the American Sugar Co., and put in an identical note on the Tramway affair." He said, "Will you please confirm this to me by cable?" Of course, that was the proper thing for me to do.

I replied that the instruction would be confirmed by cable forthwith, since time was of the essence.

That note, which I had delivered to the Cuban Government about Tinguaro, said, "If this intervention is tantamount in whole or part to an expropriation, then my Government expects adequate, effective, and prompt compensation to be paid to this U.S. company." Very simple.

Simple? Yes, but very effective in the case of the Tinguaro sugar mill (I won't go into other details of that story now). I immediately dictated a cable of instructions to Norweb. I didn't know about departmental procedure, but fortunately I happened to be in my office about 7 o'clock that evening, when Blanche Halla—one of the finest departmental officers I ever knew and head of the Office of Coordination and Review called up and said, "Mr. Secretary, you can't send that telegram; you must have seven or eight initials on it from all the interested divisions, and even the Department of Labor, and you haven't any but your own."

I knew perfectly well—I had learned enough by that time—that it would take a week or more to send somebody around to get signatures in routine fashion. I might get the requisite initials in a couple of days, if I took somebody of importance, Ellis Briggs, for instance, and sent him around from person to person saying "Pretty please, give me your initials." The Labor Department initials were required because the "intervention" resulted from a strike on the tramway company. So I pled with Mrs. Halla, "Please let it go out. I will take full responsibility." Thanks to Mrs. Halla's courageous cooperation it went out; Harry Norweb put in the note, the strike and the intervention ended in a flash, and the whole thing was fixed. I was very pleased with myself.



But about a week later, Ellis Briggs and Jim Wright, my two principal assistants—I don't think Tom Mann was with me by that time—came in and said, "Good God, Spruille, what have you done?"

I asked, "What do you mean?"

They replied, "Well, you've sent out this cable without getting all these necessary initials on it; you've broken every regulation in the books; you had no right to do it. They've got you cold, and they are all demanding a meeting and rectification" (whatever that meant).

They all—about 25 of them—came to this meeting, every one of them; my office was filled. They sat in a great big circle, and started in on me. Thanks to the Lord, they didn't make the issue on the lack of initials on the telegram. Instead, they charged that I had interfered with the rights of labor by putting an end to this intervention and strike in the manner that I had, and from there, they went on loudly and at length protesting my actions.

Finally, I said, "Well, I want to tell you something. As long as I'm Assistant Secretary of State, I'm going to protect American property rights. All your talk about the strike and the rights of labor are so much hooey in this case. I never even mentioned labor or the strike in my telegram. I won't listen to you. Good afternoon." They were so taken aback that they got out, without even mentioning the initials. So I won the fight, but only by luck. The thing I want to impress on you, gentlemen, is that the majority of the group who called on me were just as leftwing as they could be.

I had a number of other experiences in the Department, which I have recited in testimony before the Senate Committee on Internal Security, such as my experience with Alger Hiss in respect of the Panama Canal. I have skipped over in Cuba, for instance, my experience with Harry Dexter White in connection with the currency and the central bank. But those shocking and revealing experiences made me realize how deep was the Communist penetration: how great their power was; and how real was the threat to our country. These, plus a number of other instances, really began to get me worried. If you are interested I suggest that you read my December 22, 1953, and April 6, 1954, testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Just before I left the Department—6 months before—Ellis Briggs, Tom Mann, Jim Wright, and I had a series of talks together because we were convinced that the Ninth International Conference of American States, to be held in Bogota, was going to face a very dangerous situation. We seriously debated taking steps to have that conference postponed, and when Norman Armour succeeded me, I warned him about it. To have had it postponed would have been very difficult, so it was not canceled, and you all know what happened there.

Today you have read about the situation in Ecuador. I might add that we know that the Communists' leader, a man named Pedro Saad, has declared that they are going to make trouble for the Conference in Quito next year. There are reports of up to 9,000 Communists now being infiltrated into the country—that's probably exaggerated—but certainly it is true some Cuban Communists have been sent there to make trouble. I think the hope that we might have in the case of Ecuador—and in a way, this is a sad hope to express, but it is a hope—is the illiteracy of the Indians, which prevents their being such apt pupils for the Communists. That may be the saving grace in Ecuador.

Guatemala: There, as you all know, we had another very bad situation. Now the Guatemalan story has never, or very rarely been told as it actually developed through the gradual seizure of power by Arvalo, Arbenz, and the Communists. However, in 1953 I became so worried that I gave a lecture at Dartmouth to sound an alarm about what was happening in Guatemala.

Now, of course, we've been blamed in Latin America for our so-called intervention in Guatemala. Actually, what happened, and here you can accuse Tacho Somoza of being a dictator, or anything else you choose, but thank God for Tacho, because he had the courage to take his own money, get his Ambassador in Washington to go out and buy planes and equipment for Castillo Armas, and that was the way Castillo Armas got going. It was only when a group of the American Republic's Ambassadors came into the State Department and said, "You're being blamed for intervention in Guatemala anyway. It doesn't matter what happens, or what the truth is, you're going to be the culprits accused of intervention, so you might as well help out now, because if you don't, Castillo Armas will lose, Arbenz will win, and then you'll have these little Communist dictators cropping up all over Central America. So you'd better take some action, and quick."



It was only then that we gave support to Castillo Armas. Of course, there is the unfortunate sequel, that both Castillo Armas and Tacho Somoza were assassinated. And there is good reason to believe that Communists certainly had a hand in that.

Just take a look around the Caribbean, to see where the Commies are. You will find Jeddý Jegan in British Guiana; the French islands, such as Martinique, with their representatives in the French Congress who are Communists; Betancourt and at least a far left regime in Venezuela; Panama weak; Guatemala weakening; Pepe Figueres hoping to return to power; Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic under severe attack; and as for Cuba, it is the most dangerous spot in the Caribbean area. I will come back to it later, precisely because it is so alarming a situation.

Rapidly glancing at South America, we find in Bolivia control seized in 1952 by the MNR, which was Marxist. Paz Estenssoro, head of the MNR, openly boasted that he was a Marxist. There was Lechin, a most important leader and Cabinet Minister, who also was head of the Trotskyite Communists I have mentioned. He boasted publicly in a speech that the Bolivian agrarian law was more radical than that of the Chinese Communists. Now, that takes some doing, to be more Communist than Mao Tse-tung. Only recently in Bolivia, there were riots because of an article in Time magazine. All U.S. citizens, including Embassy personnel, had to be given refuge under armed guards outside of La Paz. I've heard any number of people, through the years, make the statement—which Time attributed to one of our diplomats—about Bolivia being divided up by her neighbor. As a matter of fact, Bolívar didn't want to have Sucre found Bolivia. He said, "It isn't viable country."

This thought about Bolivia goes far back.

During the Chaco Peace Conference, I remember we had a terrific time, because Saavedra Lamas, the Argentine Foreign Minister, wanted to make a deal—it was a very complicated deal—but the net of it was to divide Bolivia in four parts, and each of the adjoining countries take a slice—Brazil, Chile, Peru, and Argentina. In that connection, there was an amusing incident. The man whom Saavedra sent to talk with President Toro, of Bolivia, to discuss a possible partition, happened to be Captain Vaca.

The Nixon riots—no use to comment on that. We know the Communist inspiration there.

Let me return to Cuba. This organization, the U.S. Council of the Inter-American Council on Commerce and Production, played a role, to an extent. I had given an interview in 1957 in which I referred to Castro being either a Communist or a Communist stooge—I didn't know which—but I also referred to the record of his having taken part in the Bogotazo. At our meeting, 2 years ago, on October 4, 1957, in that suite in the Savoy Plaza, our luncheon speaker was Terry Sanders, who is one of my old boys and splendid Foreign Service career officer of highest integrity, who worked for me in Colombia, now head of, I think, the South American division. I got Terry aside at that meeting and said, "Terry, I have just gotten the information—not as it was reported later in the press of April 1959—that we have notified Batista that we are going to stop the shipment of all arms to him." That meant not only all the arms and munitions that his Government had bought and paid for, but including those that had been recommended by our military, air, and naval missions. I said, "For God's sake, don't do that. Please tell the higher echelons in the Department what I am saying to you. It is impossible for us to be neutral in this matter. The Cuban Government has been defending us in the United Nations, tooth and nail. They're a friendly government. We have forced them to buy many of these arms. But the thing that concerns me, knowing the Cuban people, is that they will interpret our stopping these shipments as meaning that we are for Castro and against Batista. If they do that, you're going to put Castro in power; if you get Castro, you're going to get chaos, the Communists are going to capitalize on that chaos and take over Cuba."

I added that the Department know of my head-on collisions with Batista; that I knew his good and his bad points; his regime might be like having ulcers, but Castro and Communist control would be a painful and fatal cancer.

Terry went to Washington and wrote me to say he had transmitted the message to Dick Rubottom and to others further up the line. Nevertheless, the fact remains that our Government has a tremendous responsibility for the situation which exists in Cuba today. Of course, it had some very able assists from Mr. Matthews and the New York Times, along with some of our other periodicals.

I won't go into the details of the Cuban agrarian reform law; it would take too long and already has been covered. Excepting, it is interesting to comment that according to the best information, it was drafted in Mexico while Castro was over there training with his men under Colonel Bayo, the famous Spanish Red. Also it really does nothing for the poor guajeros.

It is further interesting to comment that the new director to run this agrarian setup is Antonio Nunez Jimenez, a well known Communist professor whose books were destroyed by court order in Cuba; the assistant director, Rafael Pino Santos, was a Communist, and while I was Ambassador in Cuba, he wrote under the name of Jorge Pino Veda in *HOY*, the Communist newspaper. He ran a column daily under the heading, "Temas Agricolas," from 1943 to 1947. Now those are the two men that have been put in charge of the agrarian law.

What are the other signs of communism in Cuba? There is Raul Castro, who is known to be a Communist; his wife, even more violently a Communist, trained behind the Iron Curtain in sabotage. All of this they try to cover up. They're hiding the fact that David Salvador, when I was Ambassador in Cuba, was a well known Communist, and he now is the head of the labor federation. He now says, "No, I'm not, I'm no longer a Communist." Nevertheless, everything that he does or says is along the Communist line. I think the same thing ought to be said about Fidel Castro, himself.

Whether Castro is a misguided idealist, an economic charlatan, or what I think he is, which is a dictator with a Messianic complex, doesn't matter—not even whether he is a Communist or not—because he surrounds himself with Communists, and every statement and every action that he takes is along that line.

There was the Cuban inspired, equipped and manned attack on Panama. In my 1954 Senate testimony, I mentioned Alger Hiss in connection with the State Department, when I was Assistant Secretary, and what he did in connection with trying to get Communists in on the Panama Canal. Now we have the Cuban Communist regime launching attacks on Panama, the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua.

Speaking of intervention, there are the resolutions passed by the Venezuelan, Salvadorean and Costa Rican Congresses, supporting these Cuban aggressions against neighboring republics. These are direct interventions. Lacayo Farfan, the Nicaraguan revolutionary leader, is living on the farm of Pepe Figueres. He is another one who hopes to make trouble.

Nor should we forget that the Ministers of the Interior of Central America, on June 7, met in Guatemala to discuss how serious the Communist threat is.

In Nicaragua, statements are made, pamphlets distributed, that anybody who sticks with the Somoza brothers is going to be shot in exactly the same way as the people—some 3,500 of these so-called war criminals—have been shot in Cuba. This is typical Communist procedure. In other words, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua and Paraguay, to an extent, are trying to operate under these threats. It is practically impossible to run an economy or to run a government under such circumstances. In short, there is a real danger of the Caribbean becoming a Red lake. I have never in my life seen the situation so bad as it is today.

Trying to wind up quickly, we find in Mexico, Argentina, Colombia and other countries, that the Communists are active. Both the Mexican and the Argentine Governments recently had to eject Soviet and satellite diplomats accredited in their capitals. Unfortunately, the most dangerous Commie in Buenos Aires is the wife of the Hungarian ambassador there; she has not been ejected yet.

The Soviet now busily is inviting the youths of this hemisphere to the Vienna conference this year. Fourteen hundred of them, as opposed to 500 in 1956. I won't take the time to give you all the numbers, but Brazil is sending the most with 250, Argentina 170, Venezuela 150.

Going back to our friend, Agustin Navarro, I received a letter from him, describing his recent tour around Latin America. He said the thing that impressed him most—it was a very rapid tour by air—was that as he left Buenos Aires, he skipped over Santiago, got to Peru, went on to Colombia, but in each place that he arrived, the pattern was identical. It was identical in that all three places had had bank strikes. The identical feature existed on the tramways and transportation—Communist inspired strikes. He said the pattern was the same right around the entire hemisphere.

There already has been some comment on Brazil, but there is a very alarming dispatch in the New York Times on June 6. I won't take time to read it to you

now, but it implied that \$16 million had been sent from the Soviet to support the Communists there.

Anti-Americanism, of course, is the main Communist objective. They don't expect to take over fully for a long time, excepting as they do it through a Castro or somebody like that. They don't want the control of government, unless it would force us to the extreme of an armed intervention. That they want very much indeed. Meanwhile they prefer to pile harassment on harassment and humiliation on humiliation for us.

I may say, in passing, that we needn't hope for any help from the Organization of American States when it comes to defending the hemisphere against Communist infiltration, by armed intervention or otherwise. The OAS simply hasn't the courage or ability to take any firm stand against communism or socialism.

What are we going to do? I don't know. What do you do when the horse has been stolen and the barn burned down? I have some recommendations in mind. But it would take too much time to go into them now, since I believe luncheon is ready. I hope my recitation of the way I have learned about communism and my alarm that today the worst situation I have ever seen exists in this hemisphere, will suffice for the moment.

#### LATER—AFTER LUNCHEON

What I endeavored to do this morning was to offer a chopping block for discussion—a discussion which might develop some solutions.

However, since evidently we will not have the opportunity for this discussion, I take the liberty of submitting the following:

(a) The best defense is a good offense. Let's stop pretending that the Communists and the Soviet respect and understand anything other than power superior to their own. Summit conferences and all talk of coexistence should be eliminated. Nor should our side keep proclaiming that never will it make the first move. Some day, our very survival may compel us to attack.

(b) The maintenance of superior power in this hemisphere. In our self-interest we should be glad to have allies elsewhere, but never count on them too much.

(c) For our common survival, all the peoples of the Americas must educate themselves thoroughly on the Communist ideology and plans and Soviet strategy.

(d) As I have repeatedly recommended for more than 15 years, we should take advantage of the Latins' instinctive and wonderful sense of humor. There are dozens of cartoonists and humorists throughout the hemisphere whose ridicule would bring the world to join with us in laughing the Soviet and Communist lies and tyrannies to scorn.

(e) Never must we forget that charity, well directed, begins at home.

(f) So soon as possible, all of us must end the wasteful, inefficient and usually futile foreign aid programs; which rarely help the recipient nations, as they simultaneously weaken, demoralize and eventually will bankrupt the Government of the United States and all its citizens.

(g) We must renew our adherence to the principles of constitutional representative government, as laid down by the Founding Fathers of our 21 sovereign and independent republics.

(h) Above all, we must reinvigorate, redouble and rededicate ourselves to our common faith.

MR. BRADEN. In connection with the agrarian reform law I think it is pertinent and you very likely have already been told this, that in the regulations that have come out, and I have them here, the "poor downtrodden peasants" that Castro is always talking about and how he is going to help them to get their land, never actually own the land.

They cannot sell the land. They can transfer it by inheritance only with the approval of this organization (INRA) that is set up to run it.

The peasant only receives 30 percent of the product that comes from that land. And in this regulation he is compelled to do many things (they have a long series of regulations). He must be on time, he must report any defects that he sees in any of the other workers. His work must be satisfactory. It is a completely communistic setup.



Mr. SOURWINE. As Major Diaz said, these people are slaves on the land, not the owners. In legal contemplation it is a form of indentured servitude entailed from father to son.

Mr. BRADEN. Exactly. I haven't seen it in the press, but my Cuban friends tell me that recently in connection with that law somebody was talking to Castro and said, "Well why have you left out of your revised constitution the reference to God" which was put in the 1902 original constitution, and was reiterated, despite the fact that there are a lot of leftwingers, in 1940 when the new constitution was drafted.

Again dependence on God was restated.

"Now you have left it out. What is your answer?"

This was over the radio. His answer was that the new Cuban agrarian reform law was much more important than God.

Senator JOHNSTON. Let's talk about something more important.

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Ambassador, do you have a copy of the regulations you speak of? The agrarian reform regulations?

Mr. BRADEN. I have a copy of the law, and then here I have the description of the regulations that are published in their own paper.

Mr. SOURWINE. I think those would be useful in our record, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JOHNSTON. That is in Spanish, isn't it?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you wish them ordered translated and inserted in our records?

Senator JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you take care of that, Mr. Mandel?

(The agrarian reform law is printed on pages 77 to 88, part I of the subcommittee's series of hearings entitled "Communist Threat to the United States Through the Caribbean," of which the instant hearing Part V.)

Mr. BRADEN. I think, in connection with the signs of communism in Cuba, some of the following points may be of interest:

There is the recent announcement by the Chinese Communists of their establishing a Chinese Communist newspaper on the island. It would be a long list of Communist activities if we went back to the beginning. I jotted a few down at random and I have undoubtedly left out a great many others: The incitation of the people against the United States, which Castro indulges in and has continuously indulged in at every opportunity, excepting only during his actual visit here in the United States when he did not insult us and kick us around.

But otherwise he continuously does so. That is terrifically important, along with the removal of English from teaching in all of the schools in Cuba. They are changing the history of Cuba in order to bring out that we went into the Spanish-American War not to help Cuba but simply for our own selfish ends.

There is a statement by Castro, that we actually delayed the winning of that war by the Cuban patriots. In the instruction of the army, which is being carried on by the Communists, everything that they do is pro-Communist and anti-United States. There is one of Castro's speeches that goes on for about five or six full newspaper pages here, because he talks for 3, 4, or 5 hours, but all the way through, if it is not direct accusations against the United States, it is by innuendo.



For instance, President Eisenhower's statement that this matter should be handled by the OAS, the Organization of American States, is attacked as an act of intervention by United States. That is creating a hatred of the American people. It isn't that this hatred existed before nor is it that the Cubans had that feeling at all, as Mr. Matthews alleges in his articles. On the contrary, never in any place in Latin America, and I have been in every one of the countries and I have lived in many of them, have I encountered the genuine friendship for the United States that there was in Cuba.

They had an organization there called *La Cera del Louvre*, which used to come out with statements which were really embarrassing to me as the U.S. Ambassador because they were so excessively friendly. They were almost too saccharine. That attempt to destroy friendship for the United States very definitely is a part of the whole Communist program just as it was in Guatemala and as it has been other places in the Caribbean.

In a printing plant in Havana before Batista fell, they found a common plant, both Castro propaganda and Communist propaganda were being printed in the same place. There are reports of arms supplied to Castro back before he won, by the U.S.S.R. Whether this can be proven or not I don't know. Versus that you have the statement to me by the consul general of Nicaragua that the Cubans that landed there and tried to provoke a revolution in Nicaragua, were supplied with arms that had the markings of the Castro 26th of July movement.

Fidel's membership—he belonged to a Communist youth movement in his early days when he was a student in Havana, and there is quite a record there, because there was another Castro—Manolo Castro—who was assassinated at Fidel Castro's instance in order for the latter to gain control of the student federation.

Castro's former brother-in-law, who was a student at the same time with him, told me of one meeting where they had 200 special seats arranged in the front of the hall and Castro was going to speak at this meeting. The brother-in-law said, "You are not going to get 200 people at this meeting."

Castro replied: "Oh, don't you worry, I have got the people and it will look fine in the photographs because all the Communists are coming out for this meeting. I don't have to worry about getting anybody else."

Mr. SOURWINE. What is the name of this brother-in-law?

Mr. BRADEN. I will have to go back to my records.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is he in the United States now?

Mr. BRADEN. I think so, probably in Miami.

Senator JOHNSTON. You can furnish us that name?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes, sir. I can get that for you.

Of course, Mr. Matthews excuses Fidel's membership in the Communist movement as just being "the exuberance of youth." Matthews admits that more than 10 years ago Castro participated in the Bogotazo in Colombia, a Communist uprising. Again this criminal action is excused as "the exuberance of youth."

Castro in some of these newspapers I have here—I am not sure whether it is Fidel or his brother Raul—says that of course they respect Russian rights. He asks why should anybody be critical of the

Communists? He says he is not a Communist but they have got to have their political rights the same as anybody else.

I think the hijacking of the planes before Batista's fall is a pretty good example of Commie tactics, the kidnaping of American citizens also is good evidence of usual Communist tactics.

The first thing they did when they took over was to eject the U.S. military, naval, and air missions, which would be a Communist-inspired action.

In their attacks on the United States they repeatedly refer to the atomic bomb, the use of the bomb in Japan, and advocate a declaration of neutrality for Cuba between the Soviet and the United States. They have eliminated all of the Army, the Navy, and the police to be replaced by Castro's own militia. Here is a picture of small boys being trained for a youth militia. There is also an article here which refers to the president of the students federation in odontology at the university requesting that university students be incorporated into a militia. Well, those militia, just as in Guatemala, Bolivia, and in China, are typical of the Communist movement.

Senator JOHNSTON. They like to get in and work then with the youth?

MR. BRADEN. Yes. I mentioned "Che" Guevara, the Argentine, who is a well-known Communist. There also is Alfredo Guevara who is no relative of "Che" Guevara. He is in charge of instructing the Castro troops in communism. The same with Camilo Cienfuegos, he is a Communist, Candido Gonzales, Santiago Diaz Gonzales, a whole bunch of them there.

I mentioned Colonel Faget, Mariano Faget. He had a very excellent assistant by the name of Captain Castaño who was his deputy. Castaño was captured and was thrown into the Cabana fortress as a prisoner. He had worked so effectively against communism that he had been sent to the United States for special training.

I am told this from a good source but probably you may want to check it with the State Department or somebody in the FBI or CIA, if you can.

Castaño, because he was sent up here for a course of training in anti-Communist intelligence work, was thrown into the jug there. Someone connected, I assume, with the Embassy said to Fidel Castro: "Look, this man is not a war criminal. He has not done anything against you. He has merely been anti-Communist. Will you please get him out?"

The Minister of Agriculture who since has resigned, was with Castro at the time and Castro said, "You go over and talk to Che Guevara and to my brother Raul."

"Che" Guevara and Raul came back and spoke to Castro. They went back to La Cabana and Castano was shot.

That is what happened to him, lickety-split, despite presumably a request from the Embassy. Whether that is true about the request from the Embassy I don't know but I got it from a good source and you may want to follow through on that.

MR. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I note that the Ambassador is referring to a number of his papers in there. Might I ask that the Chair instruct that the Ambassador may offer for the record and there may

be inserted in the record any of the documents that he has there which he deems pertinent?

Mr. BRADEN. This is just a memorandum that I drafted. I could probably best send you down a copy of this, have it made up in a fresh copy because it has got my own scrawl all over it.

The war crimes trials I have already covered as I have the teaching of Marxism and having the Cuban Constitution canceled out. Bishop Martinez Dalmau, who is the Catholic bishop of Cienfuegos, has been forced to leave the country.

I know that the cardinal, Monsignor Arteaga, is none too happy with the situation.

Senator JOHNSTON. He had to leave the country. Where did he go to?

Mr. BRADEN. He went to Europe somewhere.

The BRAC was the government's anti-Communist organization. Of course, the revolutionaries seized immediately all of the BRAC documents and everything that they had in their files, including lists of Communists. Everything was promptly destroyed.

That was one of the very first things that they did. I am reliably informed that there are two Soviet labor experts presently in Cuba. There are also stories about some of the Soviet emissaries coming over there as early as January 7 or 8. Immediately they opened Hoy, and the Communist radio and TV stations, immediately that Castro got in power, which doesn't sound as if he was too anti-Communist.

There is a curious nuance in all of this. One has to know Spanish to get it; I didn't realize it until the owner and publisher of La Prensa called to my attention how Peron was changing from Nazi or Fascist expression to Communist expressions, and he cited some of them.

It is interesting to note in Fidel's speeches that he frequently uses expressions that are typically Communist, the attacks on imperialism and so forth. It is a rote that they follow.

It is interesting to note also that Castro praised and had consultation with Albizo Campos, the Puerto Rican agitator who wants independence. This just recently appeared in one of the papers; I haven't it here, I think I probably threw it away. There was a speech by Castro in which he was whooping it up for Puerto Rican independence. He doesn't give a darn about Puerto Rican independence. It is just simply more agitation against the United States.

I have referred to the teaching of English in primary schools; it is being cut out. There are cultural organizations, for instance Nuestro Tiempo, which push the Red line in study clubs, lectures, and little theater groups.

In other words, you find typically Communist activities and procedures as you go down a long list of things. Practically every day there is something new coming up in connection with these Communist tactics.

Here is the copy of the agrarian law I was looking for. It is in Spanish. I don't know whether you would like that or not.

Senator JOHNSTON. We will have that translated into English.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Ambassador, I am informed that the name of Castro's brother-in-law is Rafael Diaz Balart. Is that correct?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes, I think that is it. This you may like to have a copy of. I haven't finished reading this myself. I only got it a few



days ago and I have been so rushed I didn't have a chance to. But this is a description that has been gotten out on the Communist nature of the whole movement. This was printed in Mexico.

Mr. SOURWINE. May that publication be an exhibit for this record rather than being inserted physically in the record?

Senator JOHNSTON. I think that would be best.

Mr. BRADEN. I apologize for this unorderly presentation, but I have been so rushed getting ready to sail for Chile.

Senator JOHNSTON. We are glad to have this information.

Mr. BRADEN. Some of the other documents, when you are through with them, I would like to get back for my files.

For instance, this is a translation made at Columbia University of the Russian newspaper Pravda on January 3, giving an orientation of the Communist line insofar as Cuba is concerned. That is translated into English.

Mr. SOURWINE. May that be received for the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator JOHNSTON. It will be received.

(The document referred to, from p. 30, vol. XI, No. 1, of "The Current Digest of the Soviet Press" for Feb. 11, 1959, reads as follows:)

#### WESTERN HEMISPHERE

##### CUBA

Cuba Is Fighting, Cuba Will Win (by V. Levin, Pravda, January 3, p. 5, 1,400 words. Condensed text.) New Year's Day has brought a sharp change in the situation in Cuba, where the people have been fighting a selfless struggle against the bloody dictatorial regime headed by General Batista. On January 1, 1959, the dictatorship of this henchman of America collapsed under the blows of the rebel movement. Batista and his cohorts fled the country. The fight in Cuba, which has become extremely intense in these days, still goes on, but the scales are tipping more and more in the direction of the patriotic forces, as foreign commentators unanimously state. \* \* \*

The inglorious end of the Batista government attests to the increasing power of the Latin American people's struggle against the oppression of the Yankee imperialists, their struggle for freedom and national independence. \* \* \*

Americans control more than one-half of Cuban sugar production and almost all electric power, communications, oil extraction and refining, nickel and iron ore. Batista was installed as Cuba's President as a loyal guard over American capital investments.

Those who stood behind the dictator were not mistaken in their calculations. American private capital, encouraged by the ruling clique, flooded the country. In August 1957, the Government abolished the taxes on the profits the monopolies were taking out of the country. A new trade agreement between Cuba and America was concluded which, in the words of *Diario de la Marina*, "encouraged increased capital investments from the United States." Cuba moved into third place in Latin America in total American private investments. In the words of Francis Segue, correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, Batista provided excellent terms for foreign investors. According to data of the National Bank of Cuba, new foreign capital investments came to \$800 million during the 6 years of Batista's rule, and at present American capital investments total more than \$1 billion. It is understandable why an overly frank American businessman declared: "You can do business with Batista."

One hand washes the other, and the American businessmen did not neglect their obligations. Some of their profits went into the strongboxes of the dictator and his cohorts. Even the American weekly the New York Times magazine was forced to admit that the Batista regime was "noted for its mercenariness."

The imperialists and their local stewards amassed untold wealth while the Cuban people were gradually impoverished. \* \* \*



Batista transformed the country into a dark realm of terror and bloody repression. In the words of the New York Times, any evidence of dissatisfaction was crushed with cruelty "unprecedented even in Cuba's turbulent history." Constitutional guarantees were abolished in the country, freedom of speech and freedom of the press were eliminated, and opposition parties were banned.

The Cuban working class raised the banner of struggle against the hateful tyranny by organizing a series of large-scale strikes. The peasantry, a large part of the intelligentsia and representatives of business circles joined in this struggle. Armed resistance to the dictatorship regime came from the rebel movement headed by a leader of Cuban young people, Fidel Castro, who is now making decisive gains.

The resistance movement is being actively supported by the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba—the advance detachment of the Cuban working class. It sees the rebels first of all as patriots who have set as their goal the revival of democratic freedoms in the country, the transformation of its backward economy, the implementation of land reform and the liquidation of illiteracy. The Popular Socialist Party of Cuba is fighting staunchly for the unity and solidarity of all patriotic forces and for a real popular liberation movement.

The ruling circles of the United States are following the development of events in Cuba with growing alarm. The first distress signal was sounded by the American companies set up in the country. Bigart, correspondent of the New York Times, cabled from Havana that business circles did not want Batista to fall because "they think this will have an effect on the concessions they have received."

The American imperialists have been generous in supplying their agents with arms. Planes, tanks, guns, and ammunition were openly supplied to the Cuban dictator on the basis of the agreement on "mutual defense of the Western Hemisphere."

Military aid to the dictator's regime evoked such indignation among Cubans and the entire world public that the U.S. Government was obliged to make a statement about stopping arms deliveries. However, the *Diario de las Americas* pointed out that despite this statement, arms continued to arrive secretly. These arms were sent from the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua, which received them free from the United States under the terms of the mutual defense agreement. In addition, the United States turned over some of its former obligations to Batista to its allies in the NATO military bloc. Britain, France, and Italy have delivered large shipments of arms and ammunition to Cuba.

The U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force missions directed the purchase and local distribution of weapons. They also trained the Cuban Army.

In the summer of 1958, the United States landed its marines near Guantanamo Naval Base. This gross act, allegedly motivated by the increasing need to guard a water pipeline, was actually brought on by the collapse of the June offensive of Batista's army. As Fidel Castro stated, Batista and Smith, the American Ambassador, hoped in this way to provoke a "clash between the North American Marines and the rebels." The brazen schemes of the imperialists met with a stern rebuff.

Very recently, Washington again attempted to find a new excuse for U.S. interference in Cuba's internal affairs. This was the Cuban people's appraisal of a recent statement of the U.S. State Department. This statement made an unsubstantiated reference to the kidnaping of two American citizens; it was virtually an ultimatum to the rebels. It demanded in an insulting tone that they stop damaging American property and threatened that certain measures would be taken if there was no compliance.

But neither Washington's threats to the rebels nor the abundant military aid he received helped Batista to hold on to the presidential throne. He left the country in fear of the wrath of the people.

Judging by news agency reports, local reaction and its Washington patrons are now making feverish efforts to maintain in power the military junta, which suits them and which would actually like to continue Batista's antipopular policy. \* \* \*

The Cuban people have drunk the dregs of bitter suffering and they cannot be cheated or frightened off. The patriots have the firm intention of carrying the liberation through to the end. "If the American Marines land in Cuba," declared the insurgent radio, "we will fight them as we fought Batista's soldiers."

The heroic Cuban people are not alone in their just struggle. The sympathy and support of all freedom-loving peoples in the world are on their side.

Mr. SOURWINE. We will have it photostated, sir, and return it to Mr. Braden.

Mr. BRADEN. They have changed the name of Camp Columbia, the military headquarters, to Camp Liberty. They put in a theater and called it Charlie Chaplin because they think we don't like Charlie Chaplin.

Senator JOHNSTON. If they are successful in setting up in Cuba a communistic-controlled government, what do you think will be the results then with the other islands?

Mr. BRADEN. Not only the other islands, you have to take the whole Caribbean into account. There you have got a very complicated situation because this leftwing movement, as I said, consists not only of the Communists—that is the Stalinist international-type Communist—there also are all kinds of gradations of Marxists, including Trotskyites. There are Socialists, some misguided idealists and others that go along with them and are their dupes.

I made the mistake the first time I met Arevalo, when I was sent to his inauguration as special Ambassador in 1945, in thinking he was a misguided idealist professor type. But I got over it when I came to have a real talk with him. I then realized he was a very astute and very clever Communist.

You have Arevalo now in Venezuela purportedly going back to Guatemala again fairly soon. He is said to be very active in this new news agency that has been established with headquarters in Havana and presumably under the aegis of Castro.

It has some Mexican stockholders mixed up in it. You have Arevalo and Arbenz and the Communists that were in Guatemala. Due to conditions in Guatemala there always is the possibility of their coming back to power by working through the Socialists and leftwing fronts.

Salvador seems to be all right, although I think we have got to go back and remember that in 1932, and at that time we did not appreciate the dangers of it, there was a Communist revolution in El Salvador in which 20,000 people were killed. That is how bad it was.

Nicaragua—Somoza's two sons are now running the country—is somewhat in the position that the Dominican Republic is under Trujillo. They are still strong but there is a continual pecking at them going on by all the rest of the people around the Caribbean with the exception of Colombia and Panama. It is pretty hard to run a business organization or a government when one has such people continually going after them in that aggressive fashion. Hence, I am nervous about that situation.

In 1945 I found out that Trujillo had made a deal—that is at the end of 1945—with the Communists on the basis that the Communists would stop attacking him throughout the hemisphere, and he would let them organize their party and operations in the Dominican Republic. However, the Communists took him seriously and started to organize effectively, whereupon he just threw them right out on their ears.

He wanted to have the attacks on him stopped, but he wasn't willing to pay the price for it.

And so he threw them out. After he threw them out, his Ambassador came to see me here in Washington to ask if I would like to get some information on Communists. I replied, "By all means." But he never was able to give me any information that was worthwhile; there wasn't any real value to it. Since then there is no question, Trujillo has been strongly anti-Communist and has been a bulwark against them throughout that whole area. Of course, he has got a lot of defects himself.

He got quite fresh when I was first named Assistant Secretary, and sent in to his Congress, which he controls completely, a bill to change the name of Dajabon to "President Franklin D. Roosevelt." That was where they had a terrific massacre of Haitians, from 10,000 to 15,000 of them.

So I called in his Ambassador and sent instructions to our Ambassador and said, "You are not going to change the name of Dajabon to President Franklin D. Roosevelt or to the name of any other American citizen because if you do I will publicly denounce you."

That put an end to that scheme. Trujillo didn't like it, so then he wanted to get a lot of arms from us, and I said, "I don't see why you should have the arms. The war is over. You have got plenty of arms as it is, and they can only be used against your own people or against neighboring countries, the Haitians. So we don't propose to give you arms. We have a firm policy here in the Department, which is that we have a greater desire for friendship and cooperation with those governments who are freely and periodically elected with the consent of the governed. These conditions do not appear to exist in the Dominican Republic. Also the war is over; therefore, we are not disposed to give you arms."

Trujillo did not like it, so he had a book written entitled "I Accuse Braden." The first part was in very bad Spanish. The second part was a still worse translation into English. Since then he seems to have gotten over his hatred for me. In fact, last year he sent his Ambassador to call on me in New York and ask if I would not come down as a guest of honor of the Republic. When I visited the northern coast of the Dominican Republic a couple of years ago, he had the Governor of the Province greet me with all courtesy. He got over his grudges. This illustrates the value of a firm and correct policy. The last part of this story may not be important for the record but I thought the Communist end would interest you.

MR. SOURWINE. Have you heard of the admission of thousands of civilian veterans into South American countries including a number of Communists?

MR. BRADEN. I heard of it, but I have no evidence.

SENATOR JOHNSTON. If they are successful in knocking out Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, what would be the result?

MR. BRADEN. I think you would get the identical situation that you have in Cuba. One of the opinions recently expressed is pertinent. One of the anti-Communist Cubans that I have talked with said that a man named Rodriguez had declared that the next to the last country, i.e., the penultimate, would be Trujillo and the Dominican Republic. When asked, "Why do you say the penultimate one? Isn't it going to be the last?"

He replied, "No, the United States is the last."



Not alone in their public speeches but in the general conversations of the Fidelistas and the Communists, the whole program is directed against the United States.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who is this Rodriguez you speak of?

You are not speaking of Dr. Carlos Rodriguez, are you?

Mr. BRADEN. No; I will find you his name. Let me go on while I have this train of thought.

Then there is Panama where the Fidelista Cubans landed recently. If you will take a map and see where they landed and where they seemed to be aiming, you will observe it was toward the Madden Dam.

If they were able to knock out the Madden Dam, it would destroy the Panama Canal because it would get rid of all the water. But the general thought is that the Cuban invaders had no idea they would be able to do that. Rather, their plan was that it would draw out our troops in protection of the Madden Dam, and so that our troops would be involved in killing Cubans.

That is the theory there. In Venezuela you have Betancourt as President. Betancourt personally assured me that he had abandoned communism.

Senator JOHNSTON. At one time he was pretty well mixed up?

Mr. BRADEN. He admitted frankly that he was a Communist at one time, but claims that he has left it.

Senator JOHNSTON. He wrote a book.

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Senator JOHNSTON. At that time he said he was going to take the lands and everything and give it to the people.

Mr. BRADEN. He then was completely an all-out Communist.

Senator JOHNSTON. Don't you think he would go with the winds?

Mr. BRADEN. He would go with the wind if it was blowing left. I don't think he would go with a right-blowing wind. But the menacing net of all this becomes apparent when you put that Accion Democratica group (Betancourt's party) together with the followers of Lazaro Cardenas in Mexico, and with other groups. Cardenas is getting on in years but I consider him one of the most dangerous men in this hemisphere; a former President.

Senator JOHNSTON. What is his age?

Mr. BRADEN. I think he is somewhere between 63 and 68. I am pretty sure it is in that range.

Senator JOHNSTON. I imagine it is nearer 68.

Mr. BRADEN. I don't think he is as active as he used to be but just this last year he visited Moscow and Peiping. He called on the Chinese and all the satellite Communists. He is scheduled to go to Venezuela because of Betancourt's election.

I don't think he has gone yet but the invitation is out for him to go. He has a following in Mexico, typified by Lombardo Toledano, who fortunately has lost power as a labor leader.

Arbenz is in Uruguay but I am told he is planning to come up to Venezuela with a view to getting back into Guatemala again. You could have an upset in Nicaragua. The Commies have tried to attack in Panama and Venezuela. Cuba, as it is in the center, is working closely with Venezuela and both countries bombarding the Dominican Republic with radio programs.



Senator JOHNSTON. So they are all after that little country, aren't they?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes. You have the chance of another Cuba in the Dominican Republic. If that does go, Haiti goes completely. That poor little country is defenseless anyway, but you have the Negro population there which under Communist domination would be very serious.

In the French Islands, Martinique and the others, Communists have been elected to the French Assembly. There is Jagan in British Guiana, so that right around the Caribbean there are Communist links which could be very bad for the United States.

Senator JOHNSTON. We have got Haiti too; it would just be a matter of time—the Virgin Islands.

Mr. BRADEN. Haiti would go right with it. The Virgin Islands—I suppose we would defend them.

Senator JOHNSTON. We would defend them but then at the same time communism would thrive. It would just blow right in there.

Mr. BRADEN. I was talking about Herbert Matthews and the New York Times. I think it a most disturbing thing; you undoubtedly read his article yesterday in which he was defending this Cuban situation. I think that article shows the degree of infiltration we have in this country; when the New York Times publishes on the front page an article declaring that Castro is not a Communist and it is all "lovey-dovey" and everything is fine down there, and moreover, the New York Times radio in New York, while I was getting dressed yesterday morning, twice I heard it booming out "Read the New York Times today. Matthews tells you all about Cuba and that Castro is not a Communist."

I don't know if you know my experience with the New York Times after I testified here, which is interesting. I know of two such instances, No. 1, back in 1951 Matthews wrote an article about my sojourn in Argentina as Ambassador, which was completely mistaken. I wrote him a very nice polite letter and I said, "You are wrong on this and I suggest that you check with your own representative who preceded you as the New York Times correspondent in Argentina and with such distinguished Argentine journalists as Tito Gainza Paz of La Prensa.

I never got a reply, much less a correction.

I let that go until I saw and protested to Matthews 2 or 3 years later. He just shuffled it off as something that was unimportant, although he lied about me. Then when I testified before this committee I made the same statement that I made today about my high regard for the career Foreign Service as a general group, admitting that they have some bad eggs in that number of men necessarily, but that by and large they compared favorably with any other group of men I have ever run across in business, education, or otherwise. My statement was so favorable to the career Foreign Service that Joe Grew, who is sort of the dean of the career group of diplomats, came to the Mayflower Hotel to thank me the next day after my testimony for the statement I had made.

I testified on Thursday, took the Congressional to New York on Friday afternoon, and sandwiched away in about the 15th page was

an article where the headline said that I had viciously attacked the Foreign Service of the United States.

The rest of the article was equally 180° away from what my testimony had been. So on Saturday I called Sulzberger and General Adler. They were not in so I telephoned young Dreyfus who is now the president of the New York Times and Sulzberger's son-in-law. When I told him what had happened he couldn't have been nicer.

He said, "I will see that that is fixed if you are willing to give some time to one of my reporters; I will have him get in touch with you this afternoon and we will put in the proper article giving the correct version."

So the reporter got ahold of me and I spent some time giving him the correct statement. He went off, called back in a couple of hours and said, "I finished the article, but I am very sorry we can't publish it." I said, "Why can't you publish it?"

Well, he said, "We didn't have our own man at the hearing of the Senate committee so we had to take the AP version and we can't change the AP."

I said, "What are you talking about? AP didn't write the headline which was as bad as the article."

He said, "No, they didn't write the headlines but we can't change anything. The editor won't publish anything on it."

I said, "Mr. Dreyfus, your vice president, told me you were going to publish a full rectification."

Nothing doing. It couldn't be done.

Senator JOHNSTON. The headline is written right there in their own paper.

Mr. BRADEN. Exactly, but they wouldn't change anything. I said, "Do you mean to tell me if AP mistakenly sends in a notice to you that I am dead, that you won't rectify that? I call you up and say look, this is very embarrassing. I am not dead I wish you would correct that. Because AP has said it, you won't change it?"

Well, that kind of put him on the spot so finally he said, "You call AP". I said, "I won't call AP. I don't know what their dispatch was."

So finally, only because I had gone to the top in the person of Mr. Dreyfus, he said, "We will call AP."

He got a man named Wallace at AP whom I had known and he immediately got their Washington correspondent on the wire. They did get in a correction of sorts on Sunday. Arthur Krock down here who didn't know about all this going on in New York, in his column without consulting with me or anybody, came out on Tuesday and said, "Former Ambassador Braden was completely misquoted by the press in his statements before the Internal Security Committee."

Mr. SOURWINE. You speak of a letter you wrote to Matthews. Could you give us that for our records here?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes, this was April 13, 1951, and I said: "I refer to the statement in your dispatch of March 22 from Buenos Aires".

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have the clipping also of his news story?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Could you offer them both for our records?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes. Those I would like to get back too. In fact could you just make a notation that everything except that little pamphlet, I would like to get back if I could.

Mr. SOURWINE. If I don't interrupt a train of thought, you have mentioned the name Rodriguez and I ask you if you meant Carlos Rodriguez and you said "No." Have you heard of Carlos Rodriguez?

Mr. BRADEN. I am not sure. Rodriguez is like Smith. I am not sure. I don't think it is Carlos.

I think I have the right name here. It is in a clipping I have underlined in blue, that you may want to put in the record. This was given to me by Faget and it speaks of the Fidelistas as sending up two groups of students from Cuba, one group for the North going all the way from the University of South Carolina to Harvard and then a group to visit the South, going to the Universities of Texas, Miami, and so forth.

And they are supposed to put over this Fidelista—Castro—Communist program on the students at these universities and then invite back to Cuba some of the students from up here with all expenses paid and the best hotel rooms.

I think you may be interested to have that in here.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think there has been an organized propaganda campaign in the United States in behalf of Castro?

Senator JOHNSTON. Is that what that was?

Mr. BRADEN. Whether it is organized or not I am not competent to say. But there certainly has been a campaign, and in the press, the way they went for it at the beginning, it was quite shocking. Now, in contrast, this fellow Matthews and several of the others have said, "We should have reported more fully on Cuba before Batista fell and we fell down in not doing so."

But they are not reporting anywhere near as fully now as they did before.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think the American people have been misled with regard to Fidel Castro?

Mr. BRADEN. No question in my mind about it. I had an experience yesterday morning. As a trustee of the Dry Dock Savings Bank, I attended a real estate committee meeting. The senior vice president of the bank turned to me and said, "Good Lord, this Matthews article that came out the day before yesterday, it is perfectly terrible."

I said, "What about it; what makes you think it is so terrible?" He said, "I had some friends in the night before last and they were all for Castro, and I was telling them that they shouldn't be, that he was a Communist and I was repeating what you had told me."

He said, "Now they pick up the morning Times and read this. They are going to think either I was lying or a fool."

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think this is to the detriment of this country that the people have been misled about Castro?

Mr. BRADEN. No question about it.

Senator JOHNSTON. Isn't the great trouble too that probably he has a great many of the people in Cuba fooled because he is kind of a hero in getting Batista out and giving them something, so to speak, when in reality he has given them nothing?

Mr. BRADEN. That's right. It is the change, as I said, from the bad boil or ulcer to cancer. But our people don't think that. They have



been fed the story that Batista was a cruel bloodthirsty tyrant, and that the people were downtrodden. Well they weren't downtrodden. There were some very grave cases of poverty in Cuba, sure, just as we have them in this country. But by and large the living standards and other conditions in Cuba were superior to the rest of the hemisphere.

It is an island. If it had not been so fraught with graft and corruption; if they just had the ordinary 5 or 10 percent cut we sometimes see in this country, instead of the terrific cuts of 40, 50, or 60 percent they had, why Cuba would be a world financial power today. But I don't think the average man in the street in this country appreciates all of this.

I think that Castro's trip up here, his putting his hand into the lion's cage or whatever it was and some of his stunts that way disgusted people a bit.

It was too hammy.

Senator JOHNSTON. Who are the main ones that got him to make that trip up here, at least initially?

Mr. BRADEN. I think it was just a darn fool move by some newspaper people. He was a spectacular figure and they wanted a show to write about.

I think you might like to have this on the record. It was given to me by the consul general of Nicaragua; the commies have threatened that everybody who cooperated with the Somozas in the present Government in Nicaragua when they, the commies, take over will be shot just the way they were shot in Cuba.

Mr. BRADEN. Then apropos of your question on the misleading by the press, we have groups up here, inter-American—what is the name of it? Frances Grant is the woman who really runs it. They have an organization with it, and they whoop it up in great style for Castro and they get out in the universities and pretend to be quite cultural about it all.

I don't think Congressman Porter has helped things very much.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you heard of a Dr. Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, sometimes spoken of as being a power behind Castro?

Mr. BRADEN. The name comes to me. Wait a minute, when you speak of his being a power, yes, somebody told me, a Cuban—I don't know him. I couldn't say whether he is the real Communist power or not but I was told that he was as editor of Hoy. Now that you refresh my memory on that; yes.

I think one man you want to keep in mind is the Spanish Communist, General Bayo.

Mr. SOURWINE. Alberto Bayo.

Mr. BRADEN. Yes; he has been very active.

Now I remember the name of the assistant director of the Agricultural Reform Organization (INRA). The new director is Antonio Nunez Jiminez, who is a Communist or fellow traveler professor. The assistant director is Rafael Pino Santos, but as the writer of *Temas Agrícolas* in the Communist paper Hoy, from 1943 to 1947, he used the pen name of Jorge Pino Vegas. Why he changed from Rafael Pino Santos to this name I don't know.

I suppose no one can ever tell why a Communist uses different names, except as a cover.



The other Rodriguez that I referred to—and you may want to talk to him—I am not 100 percent sure but some of the Cubans think that he might have been sent up here as an espionage agent by Castro. He came along with the first Captain Rodriguez, you remember the first bearded one that came up here in a uniform as protestor against Castro. He and his cousin Rodriguez ran a series of articles in the *El Diario De Nueva York*.

Mr. SOURWINE. We have the articles I believe.

Mr. BRADEN. The one who wrote those articles is D. Francisco Rodriguez Conciero, and his address is 1325 Southwest 13th Avenue, in Miami, Fla.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would this be Francis Rodriguez Conciero?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is more a Brazilian name than a Spanish name.

Mr. BRADEN. Yes, but he is a Cuban. He makes a pretty good impression except for a flabby handshake. Some of the Cubans think he is all right and some of them distinctly not. What he is I don't know. He was talking, I was rather interested, he came to see me a few weeks ago and he talked about Carlos Marques Sterling, the son of a former Ambassador here in Washington who has been a political leader and was a candidate for the last elections for the presidency. He has now been forced to take refuge in one of the embassies in Havana and undoubtedly will get out of the country.

I think you might find that Marques Sterling will wind up here, and if he does he will be an interesting witness. He ought to be, although he is a bit on the reserved side. During the last change in the decree laws in Cuba, the death penalty was inserted. It definitely had been excluded from the constitution which the Castro gang declared they had accepted. It may be exercised against anybody who is an anti-revolutionist. Anybody who does anything economically that would hurt the country, and anybody who gives any information to any foreigner about Cuba is subject to the death penalty, so that all of these people that I have mentioned I am sure are perfectly willing to testify.

I think probably excepting for any questions you have, I have about covered it.

I have given you all the names that were lacking I think.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have mentioned the names of a number of persons whom you thought might be witnesses for us. Have you any others to suggest?

Mr. BRADEN. No; those are the best ones, the most responsible and the best type of men to do it.

Mr. SOURWINE. How could we best check on the reliability of Dr. Rodriguez Conciero?

Mr. BRADEN. I have been trying to do that myself and I have not reached a conclusion yet. I think that probably he is all right, but I am not sure and would be very cagey about anything I said when he was around.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator JOHNSTON. Aren't they a little fearful not to help him under the circumstances?

Mr. BRADEN. That is one of the problems that arises there.

Senator JOHNSTON. If they don't help him a little bit he won't let them exist.

Mr. BRADEN. Yes. But Nunez Portnondo or Faget or Garcia Montez, men like that or Garcia Reyneri, those men I will put my hand in the fire for, they are all right. The same thing with Cajigas, a very high class businessman without question.

Senator JOHNSTON. What line of business does he do mostly?

Mr. BRADEN. He had big farming properties in Cuba and then he had manganese mines in Oriente Province in the Sierra where all of this Castro business started, and everything that he had has been taken away from him, everything, every bit of property he had.

Senator JOHNSTON. Will they be able to sell the products even if they make them?

Mr. BRADEN. They won't know how to sell the sugar——

Senator JOHNSTON. That is what I mean.

Mr. BRADEN. And molasses and alcohol on the world markets. The beef they have confiscated they kill and they are distributing the meat in Cuba now. They will wind up in economic chaos.

Mr. SOURWINE. What has our subsidy to Cuban sugar per year been running?

Mr. BRADEN. I don't know the figures. We bought sugar during the war on a government-to-government basis, and of course I was active in the negotiations at that time. I got in wrong with a lot of the sugar people there because I refused to raise the price for sugar. I said, "No, you are getting a sufficiently high price."

Senator JOHNSTON. For your information, what we do, we give a certain percent to the different sugargrowing countries, and in recent years we have been giving Cuba and Puerto Rico and some of the others—of course, they come in directly down there—Mexico, a little bit more, and have cut down on some other countries.

We cut down on the Dominican Republic and gave it to some of these other countries like Cuba.

Mr. SOURWINE. We are giving Cuba 5 cents and the world market price is about 2 cents—2, 3, or 4 now I think.

Senator JOHNSTON. I was talking about a quota. That is what I was speaking of.

Mr. BRADEN. During the war we of course had to have all the sugar and molasses and alcohol that they could produce.

That is one of the principal dangers that I see in this whole situation; if the Communists are able to create this chaos we can't get the sugar, molasses, or alcohol from Cuba; we can't get the petroleum from Venezuela, and we could not fight a war without those things.

Senator JOHNSTON. Coffee.

Mr. BRADEN. Well, I suppose we could fight a war without coffee, but we wouldn't like to. We could.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you say in view of this Communist threat in Cuba it might be a good idea for the United States to start expanding sugar production in this country?

Mr. BRADEN. I think that is the one present way of bringing any reason to them at all.

Mr. SOURWINE. For our own sake.

Senator JOHNSTON. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no more questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JOHNSTON. We certainly appreciate your coming down. We can take this and of course we would not make this an open record until we had studied it and also got in touch with you.

We certainly appreciate your coming here today and giving us this valuable information because we feel you know very well the situation that we are facing.

Mr. BRADEN. I am very glad to do it. It is a patriotic duty to do it. (Whereupon, at 4 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.)





# INDEX

---

NOTE.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee attaches no significance to the mere fact of the appearance of the name of an individual or an organization in this index.

## A

	Page
Accion Democratica group (Betancourt's party)-----	281, 298
Acheson, Dean-----	246
Acosta Hurtado, Mario-----	277
Adler, General-----	300
A.F. of L.-----	266
Agrarian reform law-----	290
Agremonte-----	272
Agricultural Act-----	265
Agricultural Reform Organization (INRA)-----	268, 289, 302
American Sugar Co-----	266
Antilles (Caribbean countries)-----	272
AP-----	300
Apristas-----	281
Arbenz-----	255, 272, 286, 296, 298
Arevalo-----	286, 296
Argentina-----	273, 299
Armas, Col. Castillo-----	253, 256, 286, 287
Armour, Norman-----	286
Arteaga, Monsignor-----	293
Association of Industrialists-----	271

## B

Barco, Colonel-----	276
Batista-----	249, 257, 262, 272-274, 279, 285, 287, 294, 302
Bayo, Colonel-----	288
Bayo, Gen. Alberto-----	302
Belt, Guillermo-----	275
Berle, Adolf-----	281
Betancourt, Romulo-----	277, 278, 287, 298
Biain, Father-----	271
Bigart-----	295
Bogotazo (Communist uprising in Colombia)-----	287, 291
Bolivar-----	287
BRAC (organization)-----	293
Braden, Hon. Spruille-----	243
Testimony of-----	244-305
1933, U.S. delegate to 7th International Conference of American States-----	243
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Chaco Peace Conference (1935-39)-----	243
American Ambassador to Colombia-----	243
Ambassador to Argentina-----	243
Assistant Secretary of State for American Republic Affairs-----	243
Braden's mining properties-----	266
Briggs, Ellis-----	285, 286
British Guiana-----	299
Buenos Aires-----	300
Bureau for Aliens (Bogota)-----	277, 278
Byrnes, Jimmy-----	246

	K	Page
Kerbaul, Eugene	-----	276
Krock, Arthur	-----	300
	L	
La Cabana	-----	292
La Cera del Louvre (organization)	-----	291
La Prensa (newspaper)	----- 254, 293,	299
Lamas, Saavedra	-----	287
Land Reform	----- 263, 264, 266-269, 271,	272
First Forum on	----- 259, 260, 268, 270, 271	
Land Reform Act	-----	261, 269, 270
"Land Reform or Death" slogan	-----	272
Lara, Juan C.	-----	276
Larrazabal, Adm. Wolfgang	-----	251
Las Villas region	-----	259
Lazaro del Pino, Rafael	-----	276
Lechin, Juan	-----	254, 257, 287
Levelier, Ambassador (Argentine Ambassador in Mexico and Uruguay)	-----	247, 285
Levin, V.	-----	294
Lombroso	-----	275
Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, speech before on April 10	-----	249-256
	M	
Maceo	-----	261, 262
Machado	-----	262, 276
Madden Dam	-----	298
Mandel, Benjamin	-----	243
Mann, Tom	-----	286
Mao Tse-tung	-----	287
Marques Sterling, Carlos	-----	303
Marshall, General	-----	275
Marti, Jose	----- 261-263, 266,	272
Martinique	-----	299
Matthews, Mr.	----- 272, 287, 291, 300,	301
Matthews, Herbert	-----	257, 299
Maximo, Gomez	-----	261
Medina, Bernardo	-----	276
Mendoza	-----	281
Mercurio, El (newspaper)	-----	282
Mexican CTAL	-----	276
Mexico	-----	294, 298
Mojica, Iglesias	-----	278
Molina, Gerardo	-----	276
Molotov	-----	285
Montes, Prime Minister Jorge Garcia	-----	273
Morro, the	-----	261
Moscow	-----	272
MNR (in Bolivia)	-----	281, 287
Murdock, Prof. George Peter	-----	252
	N	
National Bank of Cuba	-----	294
National Security Agency (Colombia)	-----	277
New York Herald Tribune	-----	294
New York Times	----- 257, 270, 287, 295, 299-	301
New York Times magazine	-----	
Nicaragua	----- 291, 295, 296, 298,	302
Nino, Alberto	-----	275
Ninth International Conference of American States	-----	286
Norweb, Harry	-----	285
Nuestro Tiempo (organization)	-----	293
Nunez Jimenez, Antonio. (See Jimenez, Antonio Nunez.)	-----	
Nunez Portuondo, Emilio	-----	273, 304

## O

OAS. ( <i>See</i> Organization of American States.)	Page
Ocampo, Salvador	276
"Office of Research and Intelligence"	246
Organization of American States	272, 289, 291
Oriente Province	304
Oriente region	259
Ospina Perez, Dr. Mariano	277

## P

Panama	296, 298
Panama Canal	298
Pan American Conference of Bogota	275
Pecic B., Milorad	276
Peña, Lazaro	283
Perez, Luis Carlos	276
Peron	247, 281, 284, 285, 293
Pinar del Rio region	259
Pino Santos, Rafael (used pen name Jorge Pino Vegas)	288, 302
Pino Veda, Jorge	288
Pino Vegas, Jorge (pen name used by Rafael Pino Santes)	302
Platt amendment	263
Polichinela	275
Popular Socialist Party of Cuba	295
Porter, Congressman	302
Potsdam Conference	246
Pravda	294
Problems of New Cuba (book)	271

## R

Ravines (former Peruvian Communist)	281
Rebel Armed Forces (of Cuba)	272
Reciprocity Treaty of 1903	261
Restrepo Botero, Hernando	276
Revolution (Cuban)	259, 260, 263-265, 269, 271
Reyneri, Finance Minister Garcia	273
Roa, Dr	263
Roa, Raul	272
Roca, Blas	276, 283
Robres, Juan de	270
Rodriguez, Captain	303
Rodriguez, Dr. Carlos	298, 301, 302
Rodriguez Conciero, Francis	303
Rodriguez Conciero, D. Francisco	303
Rodriguez, Guillermo	276
Roosevelt, President Franklin D.	297
Rotary Club, speech before on April 9	249-256
Rubio, Jaime	276
Rubottom, Dick	287
Rural Guard (police)	259, 268
Russell, Don	246
Ruz. ( <i>See</i> Fidel Castro.)	

## S

Saad, Pedro	286
Saladrigas, Dr. Mario	273
Salvador, David	272, 288
Sanchez Amaya, General	276
Sanders, Terry B.	248, 287
Santiago, Chile	258
Segrue, Francis	294
Serrano, Pablo	277
Seventh International Conference of American States	282
Sierra	264, 265, 304
Siglo, El (newspaper)	278



	Page
Smith, American Ambassador	295
Social Science Research	254
Somoza	296
Somoza brothers	288, 302
Somoza, President (of Nicaragua)	253, 256
Somoza, Tacho	286, 287
Sourwine, J. G.	243
Spain	262
Spanish-American War	290
Stalin	272, 284
Standard Oil Co.	266
State Department	247-249, 254, 263
Stevenson, Adlai	281
Suazo, President Siles	254
Sucre	287
Sulzberger	300

## T

Tariff reform	271
Tax reform	263, 271
Temas Agricolas	302
Tiempo, El (Caracas)	279
Time magazine	254
Toledano, Lombardo	276, 298
Toro, President	287
Trotskyite	272
Trudeau, Lt. Gen.	249, 250
Trujillo	296, 297
Truman, President	284

## U

United Fruit Co.	266
United Nations	273
U.S. Information Agency	254
U.S. Inter-American Council (USIAC)	280, 287
University's Catholic Youth, The	266
Urrutia, Dr.	279
Uruguay	268, 298

## V

Vaca, Captain	287
Venezuela	296, 298
Ventimilla	262
Vieira	276
Virgin Islands	299

## W

Wallace	300
Waugh, Mr.	279
White, Harry Dexter	245, 286
World War II	261
Wright, Jim	286









BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



**3 9999 05445 3350**



